arXiv:dg-ga/9607005v1  19 Jul 1996

Matthias Lesch

---

# Differential Operators of Fuchs Type, Conical Singularities, and Asymptotic Methods

Matthias Lesch
Humboldt–Universität zu Berlin
Institut für Mathematik
Unter den Linden 6
D–10099 Berlin

email: lesch@mathematik.hu-berlin.de
Preprints available from
http://spectrum.mathematik.hu-berlin.de/~lesch

# Preface

This book is a revised version of the authors Habilitationsschrift which was submitted to the Institut für Mathematik, Universität Augsburg, June 1993. It was accepted in February, 1994.

I apologize to the mathematical community that it took so long until this book is made available to a greater audience. Originally I planned to extend the material and present, jointly with JOCHEN BRÜNING, a larger treatise on geometric analysis. Although this idea is not given up completely, it is a long term project and so I decided to publish this Habilitationsschrift more or less as it is. I made some minor changes due to the suggestions of the referees, I tried to smooth a bit the terrible first English version (in summer 1993 I had to translate the original German manuscript within a few weeks), and I added a summary and some bibliographic notes to each chapter. Still, the reader can hardly overlook that English is not my mother tongue and I apologize in advance for the certainly remaining lingual errors.

The reader should be familiar with basic functional analysis and the analysis of elliptic operators on compact manifolds. I also assume some familiarity with the asymptotic analysis of the heat trace.

The book consists of five chapters. Although the chapters are not completely independent and I suggest to read the book linearly, the book can be divided into two groups of chapters:

- Chapters I, II and V present the theory of general FUCHS type differential operators, including the asymptotic analysis of the heat kernel and an index theorem.
- Chapters III and IV deal with operators of first and second order. They can be read more or less independently of the other Chapters.

Usually I omit the chapter number in the numbering of equations. References like (4.1) are used to refer to equation 4.1 within the same chapter. From another chapter I would use the reference (2.4.1) to refer to equation 4.1 in Chapter II. A few very common notations will be used in the text without explanation. These are listed at the beginning of the list of symbols on page 157. All other notations are explained at their first occurence and they are listed on page 157 with the page number of their first occurence.

I curse the day on which I decided to set up names in small caps. Certainly the annoyance reached its climax when I had to change the word "Fuchs" into "FUCHS". Nevertheless, a book about FUCHS type operators should at least say a few words about IMMANUEL LAZARUS FUCHS (1833–1902). He was a student of WEIERSTRASS and building on work by the French mathematicians BRIOT and BOUQUET, and on RIEMANN's memoir about the hypergeometric equation, he initiated the systematic study of regular singularities of linear ordinary differential equations in the complex domain. In the English speaking world the term "regular singular operator" is more common than "FUCHS type operator". The latter is used in Germany and since the original manuscript was written in German, I decided (laziness and an $\varepsilon$ of patriotism, admittedly!) to leave it as it is. Still, there will probably remain some inconsistencies about the typesetting in small caps.

There are many people to thank. Foremost I am grateful to my advisor and collaborator JOCHEN BRÜNING for many years of joint work. I wish to thank BERT–WOLFGANG SCHULZE for inviting me several times, first to KARL–WEIERSTRASS Institut and then to University of Potsdam. A series of private lectures, in which he explained his calculus to me, essentially initiated the present work.

My friends at Augsburg, of whom I would like to mention NORBERT PEYERIMHOFF and HERBERT SCHRÖDER, accompanied the project with interest and constructive criticism, mathematically and non–mathematically.

Finally I thank JÜRGEN TOLKSDORF for the careful proofreading and, of course, ULRIKE for her love and patience.

Berlin, June 1996 MATTHIAS LESCH

# Contents

**Introduction** **1**

**Chapter I. Differential Operators of Fuchs Type** **9**
- Summary . . . 9
- 1.1 Differential Operators, Mellin Transform and Conical Singularities . . 10
- 1.2 Weighted Sobolev Spaces . . . 21
- 1.3 The Parametrix Construction . . . 26
- 1.4 The Singular Elliptic Estimate . . . 37
  - 1.4.1 The Singular Elliptic Estimate for APS Boundary Conditions . 44
- Bibliographic Notes . . . 45

**Chapter II. Asymptotic Expansions** **47**
- Summary . . . 47
- 2.1 The Singular Asymptotics Lemma . . . 48
- 2.2 The Scaling Property on the Model Cone . . . 58
- 2.3 Operators of Order 1 and 2 . . . 61
  - 2.3.1 The one–dimensional Case . . . 61
  - 2.3.2 The General Case . . . 66
- 2.4 The Main Theorems . . . 70
- 2.A Appendix A: An Asymptotic Relation for the $\Gamma$–Function . . . 75
- Bibliographic Notes . . . 78

**Chapter III. Relative Index Theory** **81**
- Summary . . . 81
- 3.1 Wave Equation and Bounded Propagation Speed . . . 83
- 3.2 Chernoff Operators . . . 89
- 3.3 Some Kernel Estimates . . . 94
- 3.4 Pairs of Chernoff Operators . . . 96
- 3.5 The Relative McKean–Singer Formula . . . 100
- 3.6 Relative Index Theorems . . . 103
- Bibliographic Notes . . . 104

**Chapter IV. Deficiency Indices and Dirac–Schrödinger Operators** **107**
- Summary . . . 107
- 4.1 Deficiency Indices of Equivariant Operators . . . 109
  - 4.1.1 G–Equivariant Symmetric Operators . . . 112
  - 4.1.2 Deficiency Indices of $Cl_k$–linear Real Operators . . . 113
- 4.2 Localization of the Deficiency Index . . . 118
  - 4.2.1 $G$–Equivariant Operators on the Model Cone $N^\wedge$ . . . 119

4.3 The Deficiency Index Theorem and the Cobordism Theorem . . . . . . 123
4.3.1 $Cl_k$–antilinear Operators . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 123
4.4 DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER Operators . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 126
Bibliographic Notes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 133

**Chapter V. $\eta$–Functions** **135**
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 135
5.1 $\zeta$– and $\eta$–Functions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 136
5.2 $\eta$–Functions of FUCHS Type Differential Operators . . . . . . . . . . . 140
5.3 The Variation Formula for the $\eta$–invariant . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 143
5.4 A glimpse at the gluing formula . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 147
Bibliographic Notes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 148

**Bibliography** **149**

**Index** **155**

**List of Symbols** **157**

# Introduction

The aim of this book is to present the analysis of elliptic differential operators on manifolds with conic singularities, where the main emphasis is on the heat equation and its applications.

Conic singularities combine two aspects. First, a manifold with conic singularities is the simplest example of a stratified space and its investigation is motivated by the desire to understand the analysis of operators on stratified spaces. Topologically these spaces are of iterated cone type, i. e. every point $p$ has a neighborhood $U$ which is topologically equivalent to

$$\mathbf{R}^k \times C(X),$$

where $C(X)$ is a cone over a stratified space of lower dimension. Hence, for the investigation of these spaces it is necessary to understand the simplest case of a single cone.

On the other hand, conical singularities and manifolds with boundary are closely related and the investigation of differential operators on manifolds with conic singularities may essentially be viewed as a variant of special boundary value problems with non–local boundary conditions. For instance, there is a considerable similarity between the index formula Theorem 2.4.8 and the index formula of ATIYAH, PATODI and SINGER [APS]. For DIRAC operators both formulas are even identical if there are no small eigenvalues.

Although conic singularities are interesting in itself, there also exist interesting applications. We mention the analytic proof of the cobordism theorem [L1] and applications to metrics with positive scalar curvature [L2]. This will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV.

The investigation of conic singularities was initiated by CHEEGER in his seminal papers [C1, C2, C3]. Several papers about differential operators of order 1 and 2 followed [Chou, BS2, BS3, BS4]. Analytically, a cone is just a cartesian product $M := (0, \varepsilon) \times N$ with a Riemannian manifold $N$. In the simplest case the metric is given by

$$g = dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N.$$

On $M$ the geometric $1^{\text{st}}$ order differential operators have the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{x} S$$

with a symmetric $1^{\text{st}}$ order elliptic differential operator $S$ (cf. Example 1–3 in Section 1.1). Now, if one considers the algebra of differential operators generated by these operators, one obtains the so–called differential operators of FUCHS type, which in this context have been introduced independently by MELROSE [M] and SCHULZE [Sch1, Sch2]. A differential operator of FUCHS type on $M$ has the form

$$x^{-\nu}\sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(x)(-x\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k, \tag{1}$$

where $\nu, \mu > 0$ and $A_k$ is a (smooth) family of differential operators on $N$. The smoothness assumption on the $A_k$ can be relaxed somewhat (cf. Definition 1.1.11), which is indeed necessary in examples. If the $A_k$ are (**C**–valued) analytic functions then this type of differential operators is, of course, well–known from the classical theory of ordinary complex differential equations. MELROSE always considers operators of the so–called totally characteristic type, in which the weight factor $x^{-\nu}$ is omitted. These operators are not modelled on cones but on complete manifolds with cylindrical ends. SCHULZE [Sch2] puts $\nu = \mu$. The introduction of the auxiliary parameter $\nu$, however, allows a bit more flexibility.

A manifold with conic singularities is just a manifold with boundary and an additional structure. This additional structure is the class of differential operators living on it. If $E$ is a hermitian vector bundle on $M$ then we denote by $\mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(M, E)$ those differential operators on $E$ which have the form (1) on a collar of the boundary (cf. Definition 1.1.11).

Chapters I and II are devoted to the study of FUCHS type operators on a compact manifold with boundary. Here we have attempted to present the theory as self–contained as possible. The only prerequisites are the local theory of (pseudo)differential operators and of the heat kernel. As standard references we refer to the books of SHUBIN [Sh] and GILKEY [G].

Section 1.1 is devoted to the background of the theory. In particular, a notion of ellipticity for FUCHS type differential operators is introduced (Definition 1.1.3). The notion of ellipticity used in this book is more general than the one in [Sch2, 1.2.2] (cf. the remark after Definition 1.1.4 and the bibliographic notes at the end of Chapter I). Furthermore, we recall some results of the local theory of (pseudo)differential operators. Then the adequate Sobolev spaces for FUCHS type differential operators, the weighted Sobolev spaces, are introduced. These are due to SCHULZE [Sch2]. However, Proposition 1.2.8, which is fundamental for later purposes, and the resulting embedding theorem with asymptotics (Corollary 1.2.9) are new. For the presentation of these results it seems appropriate to recall briefly the theory of weighted Sobolev spaces.

In Section 1.3 we construct parametrices for elliptic differential operators in $\mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}$. This could be done more conceptually by using the pseudodifferential calculus for conical singularities developed by SCHULZE. However, for several reasons we decided to present a parametrix construction independent of this theory: in this book we deal exclusively with differential operators. For these operators the parametrix can be constructed via a relatively simple ad hoc method. Basically we generalize the method of [B3, Sec. 3.] to operators of arbitrary order. However, in contrast to loc. cit. we use the MELLIN calculus. The direct method used in loc. cit. seems to be limited to operators of order 1 and 2.

On the other hand, SCHULZE's calculus is explained in detail in his books [Sch1, Sch2]. Therefore we do not want to repeat this here. Instead, for the purpose of a self–contained presentation, we decided to give a pedestrian approach to the parametrix construction.

The main result of Section 1.3 is the following proposition (cf. Proposition 1.3.16).

**Proposition 1** *Let $M$ be a compact manifold with boundary and let $P$ an elliptic differential operator of* FUCHS *type. Then all closed extensions of $P$ are* FREDHOLM *operators and the space*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$$

*is finite dimensional.*

This proposition is a generalization of [B3, Theorem 3.4]. The dimension of the space $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ can be expressed in terms of the MELLIN symbol of the operator (Corollary 1.3.17), which generalizes [BS3, p. 671 ff]. At the end of Section 1.3 we note some consequences, for instance, a global Gårding inequality (Proposition 1.3.18) and an elliptic estimate with asymptotics (Corollary 1.3.20).

The latter we take as a motivation for a certain axiomization, which is undertaken in Section 1.4. We consider an elliptic differential operator, $P_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$, on a hermitian vector bundle over a Riemannian manifold $M$. Let $P$ be a closed extension of $P_0$. A priori $M$ is not compact and hence may have singularities. Certainly, the following can serve as a coarse model for this situation: let $U \subset M$ be an open subset with compact boundary such that $M \setminus U$ is a compact manifold with boundary. $U$ represents the singular set, e.g. a collar of the boundary of $M$ in case of FUCHS type operators. Now we face the following problems:

1. Is $P$ a FREDHOLM operator?
2. If we want to apply the heat kernel method, we need the operators $e^{-tP^*P}$ and $e^{-tPP^*}$ to be of trace class. This is certainly the case if we can prove discreteness and an a priori estimate
$$\lambda_j \geq Cj^\delta$$
for the eigenvalues of the operators $P^*P, PP^*$.
3. We assume that we have a "model manifold" (for instance the infinite cylinder $(0,\infty) \times N$) for the singular set. Let $P_1$ be the model operator on the model manifold. Is it possible to compute the asymptotics of the heat kernel by means of the model operator? I. e. let $\varphi$ be a cut–off function near $U$. Do we have
$$\mathrm{Tr}(\varphi e^{-tP^*P}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\varphi e^{-tP_1^*P_1}) + O(t^N),\ t \to 0$$
for arbitrary large $N$?
4. If 1. – 3. are answered affirmatively, it remains to study the asymptotic expansion of the heat trace of the model operator.

Now, the point is that we can answer 1. – 3. affirmatively by means of a single a priori estimate. 1. – 3. are satisfied, if there exists a $\varrho \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(M) \cap C(M)$, $\varrho | U \in L^2(U)$, and a $l \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that for $s \in \mathcal{D}(P^l)$ with $\mathrm{supp}\,(s) \subset U$ we have

$$|s(x)| \leq \varrho(x)(\|s\|_{L^2(U,E)} + \|P^l s\|_{L^2(U,E)}).$$

We have called this estimate the singular elliptic estimate. Indeed, if $U$ is an open subset of a compact manifold then this estimate follows, with $\varrho = \mathrm{const}$, from the elliptic regularity (Lemma 1.1.17). For differential operators of FUCHS type it follows from Corollary 1.3.20. The remainder of Section 1.4 is devoted to the derivation of 1. – 3. from the singular elliptic estimate. This allows a simple kernel estimate (Lemma 1.4.5) from which 2. and 1. follow. 3. follows from DUHAMEL's principle (page 40ff). In Section 1.4.1 we present a second example. Namely, we prove the singular elliptic estimate for the so–called ATIYAH–PATODI–SINGER (APS) boundary conditions. It will turn out that in Chapters IV and V FUCHS type operators and APS boundary conditions can essentially be treated simultaneously (see also below).

It seems natural, that point 4. requires more special properties of the operators under consideration. Now we face the problem of computing the asymptotic expansion

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\varphi e^{-tL}), \quad t \to 0,$$

for a positive operator

$$L = x^{-\nu} \sum_{k=1}^{\mu} A_k(x)(-x\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k$$

on the model cone $(0,\infty) \times N$. Here, $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ is a cut–off function, which is 1 in a neighborhood of 0. The crucial additional property is the *scalability* of these operators on the model cone. Namely, there is a natural action of the multiplicative group $\mathbf{R}_+ := (0,\infty)$ on the space $L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, L^2(E|N))$ which is given by

$$(U_\lambda f)(x) := \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} f(\lambda x).$$

The fundamental observation is that in case of constant $A_k$ we have

$$U_\lambda L U_\lambda^* = \lambda^{-\nu} L.$$

This scaling property was discovered by CHEEGER for the signature operator [C3] and has played a crucial role in the papers [Ca2, BS1, BS2, BS3, BS4]. In another context it also occurs in the theory of wedge Sobolev spaces [Sch2].

The scalability allows us to apply the "singular asymptotics lemma" (SAL) of BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS1]. Hence, in Section 2.1 we give a comprehensive exposition of the SAL and related results. For that purpose we introduce regularized integrals based on the MELLIN transform. In our approach, the additional log–terms in SAL find their explanation as correction terms in a change of variables rule for regularized integrals (Lemma 2.1.4). For our purposes we have generalized SAL to cover finite asymptotic expansions with remainder terms.

In Section 2.2 we exploit the above mentioned scaling property. We introduce invariants of the MELLIN symbol via $\zeta$– and $\eta$–functions. These invariants will show up as coefficients in the expansion of the heat trace and in the index formula.

The coefficients of $t^0$ and $\log t$ in the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel can be calculated rather explicitly for operators of order 2. This we have worked out in Section 2.3 where the results, of course, are not new. However, we have tried to give a, as far as possible, self–contained presentation in which we have to refer to handbooks of special functions only at a few points. Moreover, we allow the whole situation to be equivariant under the action of a compact LIE group. Section 2.4 contains our main results about FUCHS type differential operators on compact manifolds with boundary.

**Theorem 2** *Let $L_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}(E)$ be a positive elliptic differential operator on a compact manifold with boundary. Let $L$ be a positive self–adjoint extension. Denote by $a_n$ the local invariants of the heat kernel of $L$. Then, $e^{-tL}$ is a trace class operator, for $n < \dim M$ the $a_n$ are integrable on $M$, and we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-tL}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{n=0}^{\dim M-1} \int_M a_n(\xi)d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-\dim M}{\mu}} + O(\log t). \tag{2}$$

An analogous result holds in the equivariant case, too (Theorem 2.4.1). An immediate consequence of Theorem 2 is the eigenvalue asymptotics of the operator $L$. As an application we obtain the $1^{\mathrm{st}}$ term in the heat asymptotics for the Laplace operator on a singular algebraic curve. Even in the one–dimensional case this yields the leading term in the heat asymptotics and consequently the asymptotics for the eigenvalues of ordinary FUCHS type differential operators on a compact interval. Note that the asymptotic expansion (2) is independent of the choice of the closed extension. If the $A_k$ are constant for small $x$ then we can prove a full asymptotic expansion (Theorem 2.4.6). A consequence is an index theorem and the $G$–equivariant version of the index theorem of BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS3] (Theorem 2.4.8). However, we were not able to prove the full asymptotic expansion for arbitrary operators in $\mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}$ (cf. the discussion after Problem 2.4.4).

In Chapter III we deal with relative index theory. In this theory one considers pairs of differential operators of order 1 which coincide on a "complete end".

The origin of this theory certainly is the seminal work of GROMOV and LAWSON [GL] on metrics with positive scalar curvature. They prove a relative index theorem for DIRAC operators on complete manifolds. However, the proof did not use the heat equation method. DONNELLY [D1] published a heat equation proof for the relative signature of two manifolds, which essentially leads to a local version of the relative index theorem of GROMOV/LAWSON. For DIRAC operators this has been carried out by BUNKE [Bu1]. In this context the restriction to DIRAC operators seems to be somewhat unnatural. In his work about hyperbolic equations CHERNOFF [Ch] states a natural condition (cf. Section 3.2) on the propagation speed of a symmetric operator, which guarantees essential self–adjointness on a complete manifold.

Now, in the present work we consider pairs of CHERNOFF operators, which coincide on a complete end and satisfy the singular elliptic estimate over a "singular set". First of all, one has to develop FREDHOLM criteria for these operators. These are analogous to those for complete manifolds because the singular elliptic estimate guarantees the "local FREDHOLMness" (Proposition 3.2.8 and 3.2.9). The main result is a local relative index theorem (Theorem 3.5.10). In addition, we consider again the whole situation to be equivariant under the action of a compact LIE group. This is new even in the case of complete manifolds (Theorem 3.6.1). The tools for the proof of Theorem 3.5.10 are kernel estimates based on finite propagation speed and DUHAMEL's principle. Kernel estimates of this kind first occur in [CGT]. A considerable difficulty in this situation is that the MCKEAN–SINGER formula is non–trivial, since the operators under consideration are not trace class. The trace class property is replaced by a kernel estimate at infinity (Theorem 3.4.3). The method we present here is due to DONNELLY [D1].

Chapter IV contains applications of the relative index theorem. For the discussion of those concepts, which typically require self–adjoint operators (e. g. spectral invariants), it is first of all necessary to develop criteria for self–adjointness. In the presence of singularities it is by no means obvious that a given symmetric operator has self–adjoint extentions at all. Therefore, we continue the discussion of deficiency indices which we began in the papers [L1, L2]. Given a symmetric operator with certain invariance properties, it is a natural question if self–adjoint extensions can be choosen in such a way that the invariance properties continue to hold. The purely functional analytic aspects of this problem are discussed in Section 4.1. This leads to deficiency indices taking values in a character ring or in $KO^{-*}(\mathrm{pt})$. The latter can be viewed as an "odd" version of the index construction of ATIYAH–BOTT–SHAPIRO. In Section 4.2 we show that (equivariant) deficiency indices localize near the singularities. Then we discuss the construction of self–adjoint extensions of $1^{\mathrm{st}}$ order operators of FUCHS type and of APS type. Section 4.3 contains the equivariant versions of the deficiency index theorem of [L1]. The case of $Cl_k$–linear operators has already been announced in [L2]. Applications are an analytic proof of the (real) Cobordism Theorem for DIRAC operators, where it plays no role whether the given DIRAC operator is compatible or not. The only crucial assumption is the form of the operator near the boundary (4.3.9). Another application is an obstruction against the existence of metrics with positive scalar curvature (Theorem 4.3.6).

In Section 4.4 DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operators will be discussed. Consider a self–adjoint elliptic differential operator, $D$, of order 1 on a complete manifold. Even if this operator is FREDHOLM, its index is, of course, 0. In his paper [Ca1], CALLIAS considered operators of the form

$$D + iA \tag{3}$$

with a self–adjoint potential $A$ on $\mathbf{R}^n$. The antisymmetric potential $iA$ destroys the symmetry of the operator and CALLIAS could prove an index theorem for these operators. For several years, this theorem was not well understood and somewhat isolated. Recently, it has been taken up by several authors [Ca1, R1, H, BM, A1, A2, Bu2, Ra] and put into a wider context. It turned out that among other things there are interesting applications to metrics with positive scalar curvature.

The form of the operator (3) indicates that there should be connections to deficiency indices: namely, if $D$ is a symmetric operator with finite deficiency indices then these are FREDHOLM indices of the operator

$$D \pm i \tag{4}$$

(cf. Note 4.1.2, Lemma 4.1.5, Theorem 4.1.14). Hence this leads to the conjecture that the deficiency index theorem and the several versions of index theorems for DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operators should be different aspects of a single theorem on manifolds with singularities. This is worked out in Section 4.4. Here we can work in a rather general setting. We consider CHERNOFF operators on manifolds with complete ends and singularities. We assume that the operators have finite dimensional deficiency spaces and satisfy the singular elliptic estimate on the singular set. This axiomatic approach allows to deal with FUCHS type operators and APS boundary conditions simultaneously. Even in the complete case we achieve a certain progress since we can state the results equivariantly and for general CHERNOFF operators. Technical tools are the deficiency index theorem and the relative index theorem in Chapter III. Since we allow the manifold to have conic singularities, we do not need the "$\Phi$–version" [GL, Theorem 4.35] of the relative index theorem.

In Chapter V we look a bit more closely at $\eta$–functions. The behaviour of the poles of the $\eta$–function of a self–adjoint differential operator $P$ is determined by the asymptotic expansion of

$$\mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2}), \quad t \to 0. \tag{5}$$

In Section 5.1 we present a general discussion of the relation between asymptotic expansions as $t \to 0, t \to \infty$ of a real function and the meromorphic continuation of its MELLIN transform. This is is related to the material of Section 2.1 and Section 5.1 can be viewed as an appendix to Section 2.1.

In Section 5.2 we discuss the asymptotic expansion (5) for differential operators of FUCHS type. Technically, this is parallel to the discussion of the heat kernel such that the presentation can be given more concisely than in Chapter II. $\eta$–functions of FUCHS type differential operators of order 1 were considered first by CHEEGER [C4], who investigated the signature operator on a manifold with conic singularities. As a by-product we also achieve the meromorphic extension of the $\eta$–function of operators of APS type, which is due to [DW]. The crucial Lemma 5.2.4 shows that on a cylinder the local invariants of $\mathrm{Tr}(De^{-tD^2})$ vanish for these operators. Here again, as well as for the proof of the variation formula in Section 5.3, our point of view is an axiomatic one. The existence of the $\eta$–function and the variation formula follow from the axioms (5.2.6)–(5.2.8). This is more general than [DW] and, in view of the technical requirements, it seems to be a progress and allows a more perspicuous presentation than loc. cit. This book ends with Section 5.4 which gives a short introduction to a new proof of the gluing formula for the $\eta$–invariant.

# CHAPTER I

# Differential Operators of Fuchs Type

## Summary

As indicated in the introduction, our motivation for the study of FUCHS type differential operators is the fact that they are the "natural" differential operators on a manifold with conic singularities, or more generally, stratified spaces. Topologically, a manifold with conic singularities looks like

$$M \cup_{(\partial M \sim \{1\}\times\partial M)} C(\partial M), \tag{1}$$

where $M$ is a (compact) manifold with boundary and

$$C(\partial M) = (\partial M \times [0,1])/(\{0\}\times\partial M)$$

is the *cone* over $\partial M$. If we remove the cone tip $\{0\}\times\partial M$ then we obtain a cylinder $(0,1]\times\partial M$. Thus, after removing the singularity, topologically the cone cannot be distinguished from a cylinder.

From the analytic point of view the difference between a cone and a cylinder is the class of natural differential operators living on it. By natural differential operators we mean those provided by Riemannian geometry, e.g. DIRAC and LAPLACE operators. Now, the metric cone over a Riemannian manifold $N$ is $(0,\varepsilon)\times N$ equipped with the metric

$$dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N.$$

It turns out that the natural differential operators on a metric cone are differential operators of FUCHS type with operator valued coefficients. In Section 1.1 we will discuss more extensively some situations in which FUCHS type differential operators occur naturally.

Section 1.1 provides the necessary background of the theory. We introduce FUCHS type differential operators and introduce a notion of ellipticity. We have tried to be as self–contained as possible. However we assume that the reader is familiar with the elements of global analysis, elliptic operators and the heat kernel. We will use freely the contents of [G], [R2], and [Sh]. At the end of Section 1.1 we have included some facts about general differential operators which might not be on the mainstream of a first course in global analysis.

The construction of parametrices for elliptic operators of FUCHS type occupies Sections 1.2 and 1.3. As already noted in the introduction, we have resisted the temptation to introduce a pseudodifferential calculus for FUCHS type operators. We prefer to use a direct method. Corollaries of the parametrix construction are a FREDHOLM criterion and an elliptic estimate with asymptotics.

The latter will be exploited axiomatically in Section 1.4 where we invent the "singular elliptic estimate" as a tool for proving trace class properties and kernel estimates.

Finally, in the short appendix 1.4.1 we show that operators of ATIYAH–PATODI–SINGER [APS] type also satisfy a singular elliptic estimate.

## 1.1 Differential Operators, Mellin Transform and Conical Singularities

The class of operators investigated in this book is motivated by certain operators arising in geometry. Hence we start with the introduction of a class of spaces.

**Definition 1.1.1** [BL2, Sec. 2] *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold,* $\dim M = m$, *with an open subset $U \subset M$, such that*

$$M_1 := M \setminus U \text{ is complete with compact boundary } N, \tag{1.1}$$

*$U$ is isometric to $(0,\varepsilon) \times N$,* $\dim N = m-1 =: n$, *with metric $g = h(x)^2(dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N(x))$, where $g_N(x)$ is a family of metrics on $N$, smooth in $x \in (0,\varepsilon)$ and continuous in $x \in [0,\varepsilon)$, and $h \in C^\infty((0,\varepsilon)\times N)$ satisfies* (1.2)

$$\sup_{p\in N} |(x\partial_x)^j (x^{-c} h(x,p) - 1)| = O(x^\delta) \text{ as } x \to 0\,, \quad j = 0,1\,, \tag{1.3}$$

*and*

$$\sup_{p\in N} \|h(x,p)^{-1} d_N h(x,p)\|_{T_p^*N, g_N(x)} = O(x^\delta) \text{ as } x \to 0\,, \tag{1.4}$$

*for some $\delta > 0$ and $c > -1$.*

*Let*

$$g^0 := dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N(0),$$

$$g^1 := h^{-2} g = dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N(x)\,,$$

*and denote by $\nabla^0, \nabla^1$ the Levi-Civita connections for $g^0, g^1$ with connection forms $\omega^0, \omega^1$. Then one assumes furthermore*

$$\sup_{p\in N} (|g^1 - g^0|^0_{(x,p)} + x|\omega^0 - \omega^1|^0_{(x,p)}) = O(x^\delta)\,, \quad x \to 0\,, \tag{1.5}$$

*where $\delta$ is as above and the superscript $^0$ refers to $g^0$.*

*A manifold satisfying these axioms is called a conformally conic manifold.*

This seems to be the most general class of manifolds where "cone techniques" can be applied. We refer to [BL2] for more details, in particular for the discussion of Kähler–manifolds.

In particular, we see that conformally conic manifolds are quasi–isometric to manifolds with metrically conic singularities. However, for many analytical questions the notion of quasi–isometry is too coarse. We will see in due course how the axioms of a conformally conic manifold determine the analytical properties of the operators living on it.

**Example** 1. ([BPS, BL3, BL4]) Let $V \subset \mathbf{CP}^N$ be an algebraic curve, $\Sigma := \operatorname{sing} V$ its singular locus. The Fubini–Study metric of the complex projective space $\mathbf{CP}^N$ induces a Kähler–metric on $V \setminus \Sigma$. Let $\pi : \widetilde{V} \to V$ be a desingularization, equipped with the pull-back metric. Then any $p \in \pi^{-1}(\Sigma)$ has a neighborhood $U$, such that

$$U \setminus \{p\} \cong \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid 0 < |z| < \varepsilon\}$$

with metric

$$g = h(dx^2 + dy^2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &h \in C^\infty(\{z \mid |z| < \varepsilon\}), \\ &h(z,\bar{z}) = N^2|z|^{2N-2} + O(|z|^{2N}). \end{aligned}$$

Here $N$ is the so–called multiplicity of the point $p$.

Introducing polar coordinates around 0, one immediately checks that $V \setminus \Sigma$ is a conformally conic manifold.

2. Consider the Gauß–Bonnet operator $D^{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathrm{GB}} : \Omega^{\mathrm{ev}}_0(M) \to \Omega^{\mathrm{odd}}_0(M)$ on a conformally conic manifold. Restricted to $U$, this operator is unitarily equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &D^{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathrm{GB}} \cong \widetilde{h}^{-1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + x^{-1}(S_0 + S_1(x))\Big), \\ &S_0 : \Omega^*(N) \to \Omega^*(N), \quad S_0 = d + d^t + C, \quad C|\Omega^k(N) = (-1)^k(k - n/2) \end{aligned}$$

with $\widetilde{h} \in C([0,\varepsilon) \times N), \widetilde{h}(0) = 1$ [BL2, 2.11].

3. More generally, operators of the form

$$B(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + x^{-1}(S_0 + S_1(x)) \tag{1.6}$$

were investigated in [B3, Sec. 3]. Here, $B(0) = I$ and $S_0$ is a $1^{st}$ order self–adjoint elliptic differential operator. Certain additional assumptions are made on the asymptotic behavior of $B(x), S_1(x)$ as $x \to 0$ (cf. Definition 1.1.11).

The point of view of these examples is, that the geometric singularity is transformed into a singularity of a geometric differential operator on a manifold with boundary. This manifold is a product near the boundary. If not we invoke another transformation onto a manifold which is a product near the boundary; this causes additional terms in the differential operator. This is the point of view of this work.

Next we introduce the standard situation which we are going to consider throughout this book:

> We consider a complete Riemannian manifold, $\overline{M}$, with compact boundary. We assume that the metric is a product near the boundary, i. e. there exists an open neighborhood, $\overline{U}$, of the boundary $N := \partial\overline{M}$, which is isometric to $\partial M \times [0, \varepsilon)$. Moreover, we put
>
> $$M := \overline{M} \setminus N, \quad U := \overline{U} \setminus N = (0, \varepsilon) \times N.$$
>
> Let $\pi : U \to N$ be the canonical projection. If $E$ is a hermitian vector bundle over $M$ with (1.7)
>
> $$E|U \cong \pi^*(E_N) \quad \text{isometrically}$$
>
> for some hermitian vector bundle $E_N$ over $N$, then we have a canonical isometry
>
> $$L^2(E|U) \cong L^2((0, \varepsilon), L^2(E_N)).$$

This will be our standard picture of a manifold with boundary. However, we want to model the analysis of differential operators on a manifold with cone–like singularities. In the geometric model (1.7) the singularity has disappeared. The singularity will be modeled through the class of (differential) operators which we are going to consider. Nevertheless, it will be convenient to refer to a manifold $M$ described in (1.7) as a *manifold with conical singularities*. This terminology will include that the class of operators under consideration will be the class of FUCHS type differential operators introduced in Definition 1.1.2 below.

Likewise, the infinite half–cylinder

$$N^\wedge := (0, \infty) \times N \tag{1.8}$$

will be adressed as the *model cone*. It serves as a model for the analysis near the cone–tip and hence will be studied extensively.

Unless it is necessary for clarity, we will not distinguish between $E$ and $E_N$ and denote both by $E$. Likewise, whenever possible, the isomorphisms in (1.7) will be used without refering to them explicitly. The space $C^\infty(U, E)$ will be identified with $C^\infty(U, C^\infty(E_N))$ in the obvious way.

If one considers powers of the operators in the examples 2. and 3., one obtains the so–called FUCHS type operators.

**Definition 1.1.2** 1. *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $E, F$ hermitian vector bundles over $M$. We denote by*

$$\mathrm{Diff}^\mu(E, F)$$

*the set of differential operators of order $\le \mu$ acting from sections in $E$ to sections in $F$. For $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^\mu(E, F)$ the formal adjoint is denoted by $P^t$.*

2. *Denote by $X$ the operator of multiplication by $x$ and put $D := -X\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$.*

*Let $M$ be a manifold with boundary as in (1.7). A differential operator of* FUCHS *type of order $\mu \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ and weight $\nu \ge 0$ is an operator $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^\mu(E, F)$ such that*

$$P|U = X^{-\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k (-X \frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k,$$

*with*

$$A_k \in C^\infty((0,\varepsilon), \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu-k}(E_N, F_N)) \cap C([0,\varepsilon), \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu-k}(E_N, F_N)).$$

*By* $\mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E,F)$ *we denote the set of all differential operators of* FUCHS *type between the bundles* $E, F$.

If it is necessary to mention the manifold explicitly, we will write $\mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(M,E,F)$ instead of $\mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E,F)$. In the sequel we will be dealing mostly with elliptic operators, hence the bundles $E, F$ will be isomorphic. For convenience, we will therefore assume $E = F$ in most situations. We point out that all results hold accordingly for two different bundles, too.

**Definition 1.1.3** *An operator* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(M,E)$ *is called elliptic, if*

*$P$ is elliptic on $M$ in the usual sense and*

$$x^\nu \sigma^\mu(P)(x^{-1}\tau, \xi) \tag{1.9}$$

*is invertible for* $(x,p) \in [0,\varepsilon) \times N$ *and* $(\tau,\xi) \in T^*\overline{M} \setminus \{0\}$,
$\xi \in T_pN$.

$\sigma^\mu(P)$ *denotes the principal symbol of* $P$.

Here we have identified $T^*\overline{M}|[0,\varepsilon) \times N$ with $\mathbf{R} \times T^*N$ in the obvious way. (1.9) means that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\mu} \sigma^{\mu-k}(A_k(x))(\xi)\sigma^k((-x\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k)(x, x^{-1}\tau) = \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} \sigma^{\mu-k}(A_k(x))(\xi)(-i\tau)^k$$

is invertible. For $x \neq 0$ this is covered by interior ellipticity. For $x = 0$ this means that

$$\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(0)z^k$$

is a parameter dependent elliptic family of differential operators with parameter $z \in i\mathbf{R}$. For the theory of (pseudo)differential operators with parameter we refer the reader to [Sh, Sec. 9]).

**Definition 1.1.4** *Following* SCHULZE *we refer to* $\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)$ *as the* MELLIN *boundary symbol or conormal symbol of* $P$ *[Sch2, 1.2.24].*

We emphasize that our definition of ellipticity is different from the one in [Sch2, Def. 1.2.16]. The additional requirement of the invertibility of the MELLIN symbol on a certain weight line can be omitted if one is willing to extend the operators to their natural domains, instead of reducing them to the weighted Sobolev spaces. See also Corollary 1.3.13 ff. and the bibliographic notes at the end of this chapter.

**Definition 1.1.5** *For* $c, c' \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}, c < c'$ *we denote by*

$$\Gamma_{c,c'} := \{z \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, c < \mathrm{Re}\; z < c'\}$$

*the open strip between* $c$ *and* $c'$. *By* $\overline{\Gamma}_{c,c'}$ *we denote the corresponding closed strip. Moreover we put*

$$\Gamma_c := \{z \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, \mathrm{Re}\; z = c\}.$$

Since the parameter dependent principal symbol of $\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z)$ is independent of $\operatorname{Re} z$, we find

**Lemma 1.1.6** *$P \in \operatorname{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(M,E)$ is elliptic if and only if $P$ is elliptic on $M$ in the usual sense and the* MELLIN *symbol*

$$\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(0) z^k$$

*is parameter dependent elliptic on each line $\Gamma_\rho, \rho \in \mathbf{R}$. In this situation the parameter dependent ellipticity is uniform in each finite strip $\overline{\Gamma}_{c,c'}, -\infty < c < c' < \infty$.*

This yields

**Proposition 1.1.7** *Let $P \in \operatorname{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ be elliptic. Then for $c, c' \in \mathbf{R}, c < c'$, there exists a constant $K$, such that*

$$\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z) : H^s(E_N) \longrightarrow H^{s-\mu}(E_N)$$

*is invertible for $z \in \overline{\Gamma}_{c,c'}$ with $|\operatorname{Im} z| \geq K$. This holds for all $s \in \mathbf{R}$. Here $H^s(E_N)$ denotes the ordinary Sobolev space of order $s$ on $E_N$.*

**Proof** [Sh, Theorem 9.2] □

**Example** The operator $P$ in (1.6) is obviously elliptic, because we have

$$\sigma_M^{1,1}(P)(z) = S_0 - z.$$

Since $\operatorname{spec}(S_0) \subset \mathbf{R}$, the statement of Proposition 1.1.7 is obvious in this situation. More generally, let $S \in \operatorname{Diff}^1(N,E)$ be an elliptic differential operator with

$$\operatorname{spec}(\sigma^1(S)(\xi)) \cap i\mathbf{R} = \emptyset \text{ for } \xi \in T^*N \setminus \{0\}. \tag{1.10}$$

Then the operator

$$P = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + X^{-1} S \in \operatorname{Diff}^{1,1}(N^\wedge, E) \tag{1.11}$$

is elliptic, too.

The next well–known result clarifies the behaviour of the MELLIN symbol for small $|\operatorname{Im} z|$.

**Proposition 1.1.8** *Let $M$ be a connected* RIEMANN *surface and let $f : M \to \operatorname{Fred}(\mathrm{X},\mathrm{Y})$ be a holomorphic family of* FREDHOLM *operators acting between the* BANACH *spaces $X, Y$. Assume that $f(z_0)$ is invertible for at least one $z_0 \in M$.*

*Then the set*

$$D := \{z \in M \mid 0 \in \operatorname{spec}(f(z))\}$$

*is discrete in $M$. Moreover, let $\xi \in D$ and $z$ be a centered coordinate system at $\xi$. Then $f(z)^{-1}$ has the Laurent expansion*

$$f(z)^{-1} = \sum_{k=-m}^{\infty} R_k z^k.$$

*If $k < 0$ the operators $R_k$ are of finite rank.*

**Proof** We divide the proof into several steps. W. l. o. g. we may assume $X = Y$; otherwise consider the function $f(z_0)^{-1}f$.

**Assertion 1:** For each $\xi \in M$ we can choose a neighborhood $U$, a decomposition $X = V \oplus W$, $\dim V < \infty$, and holomorphic functions $\varphi, \psi : U \to G\mathcal{L}(X)$, $h : U \to \mathcal{L}(V)$ such that on $U$

$$\varphi f \psi = \begin{pmatrix} h & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Id}_W \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.12}$$

*Proof of Assertion 1:* We put $A = f(\xi)$ and note that $A$ is a FREDHOLM operator of index 0, because $M$ is connected and $\mathrm{ind} f(z_0) = 0$. We put $V := \ker A$ and choose a complementary subspace $W$ of $V$. This is possible because $\dim V < \infty$. Analogously let $V'$ be a complementary subspace to $A(W)$. We have $V' \cong \mathrm{coker}\, A$ and since $\mathrm{ind} A = 0$ there exists an isomorphism $\Phi : V \to V'$. We put

$$\varphi_1 : X \to X, \quad \varphi_1 | A(W) := (A|W)^{-1}, \quad \varphi | V' := \Phi^{-1}.$$

Then $\varphi_1 \in G\mathcal{L}(X)$ and $\varphi_1 A$ is the projection along $V$ onto $W$. With respect to the decomposition $X = V \oplus W$ we obtain

$$\varphi_1 f = \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} \\ h_{21} & h_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $h_{22}(\xi) = \mathrm{Id}_W$. Thus, there is a neighborhood $U$ of $\xi$ such that $0 \notin \mathrm{spec}\, h_{22}(p)$ for $p \in U$. On $U$ we put

$$\varphi_2 := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_V & -h_{12}h_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & h_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and obtain

$$\varphi_2 \varphi_1 f =: \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{h}_{11} & 0 \\ \widetilde{h}_{21} & \mathrm{Id}_W \end{pmatrix}.$$

Putting

$$\psi := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_V & 0 \\ -\widetilde{h}_{21} & \mathrm{Id}_W \end{pmatrix}$$

Assertion 1 is proved.

**Assertion 2:** Let $\widetilde{D} := \{p \in M \,|\, 0 \in \mathrm{spec}\ f(z) \text{ for } z \text{ in a neighborhood of } p\}$. Then $\widetilde{D}$ is open and closed.

*Proof of Assertion 2:* By definition $\widetilde{D}$ is open. For proving that it is closed we choose a sequence $(p_n) \subset \widetilde{D}$ converging to $p \in M$. In view of Assertion 1 there exists a connected neighborhood $U$ of $p$, where we have

$$\varphi f \psi = \begin{pmatrix} h & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Id}_W \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $n$ is large enough, we have $p_n \in U$. Hence there is a neighborhood $V$ of $p_n$, $V \subset U$, such that $0 \in \mathrm{spec}\,(f(z))$ for $z \in V$. But then $\det h(z) = 0$ for $z \in V$ and since $\det h(z)$ is holomorphic, $\det h(z) = 0$ on $U$. In particular we have $0 \in \mathrm{spec}\,(f(p))$.

By Assertion 2 we have $\widetilde{D} = \emptyset$ or $\widetilde{D} = M$. Certainly $z_0 \notin \widetilde{D}$, therefore $\widetilde{D}$ must be $\emptyset$.

Now, if $\xi \in M$ is arbitrary and $U$ is chosen such that (1.12) holds, then we have $\det h \not\equiv 0$ on $U$, thus $U \cap D$ is discrete. But then $D$ is discrete. Now the last assertion is an easy consequence of Assertion 1 and Cramer's rule. □

From what we have done so far, we obtain immediately

**Proposition and Definition 1.1.9** *Let* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ *be elliptic. The set*

$$\operatorname{spec} \sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P) := \left\{ z \in \mathbf{C} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} \sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z) : H^s(E_N) \to H^{s-\mu}(E_N) \\ \textit{is not invertible} \end{array} \right\}$$

*has the properties*

(i) *For* $c, c' \in \mathbf{R}$ *the set* $\overline{\Gamma}_{c,c'} \cap \operatorname{spec} \sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)$ *is finite.*

(ii) *The principal part of the Laurent expansion of* $(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z))^{-1}$ *about* $\alpha \in \operatorname{spec} \sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)$ *is given by*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha} R_{\alpha k}(z-\alpha)^{-(k+1)}$$

*with smoothing operators* $R_{\alpha k} \in C^\infty(E \boxtimes E^*)$. $m_\alpha$ *will be called the multiplicity of* $\alpha$.

**Remark** In view of the ellipticity of $P$, it is clear that $V \subset C^\infty(E)$ and that $h$ is a smoothing operator. Hence, the $R_{\alpha k}$ are smoothing operators. Here we have used the denotations of the last proof.

**Example** Let $P$ be the operator in (1.11). We have $\sigma_M^{1,1}(P)(z) = S - z$. We consider $z_0 \in \operatorname{spec}(S) = \operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{1,1}(P))$. Since $S$ has a compact resolvent, by the Riesz–Schauder theory, we have a direct sum decomposition

$$L^2(N, E) = V \oplus W$$

with $\dim V < \infty$ and with respect to this decomposition we have

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} z_0 + R & 0 \\ 0 & S_1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.13}$$

with nilpotent $R$ and $z_0 \notin \operatorname{spec}(S_1)$. Now, the principal part of the Laurent expansion of $(S-z)^{-1}$ around $z_0$ is given by

$$-\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (P_V R P_V)^k (z - z_0)^{-k-1}, \tag{1.14}$$

where $P_V$ denotes the projection along $W$ onto $V$. Thus, $m_{z_0}$ is the order of nilpotency of $R$ and $R_{z_0 k} = -(P_V R P_V)^k$.

For certain subclasses of $\mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ we now want to investigate the following problems

- Characterization of closed extensions
- FREDHOLM criteria
- Criteria for descreteness and the asymptotic behaviour of the eigenvalues of self–adjoint operators

- Asymptotic expansions of the heat kernel of positive operators and their relation to the index problem

Next we introduce certain subclasses of $\mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E)$.

**Definition 1.1.10** $\mathrm{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ *is the set of* FUCHS *type operators*

$$P = X^{-\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k D^k \tag{1.15}$$

*with constant coefficients* $A_k \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu-k}(N, E)$.

**Definition 1.1.11** *Let $M$ be a manifold with conic singularities, $E \to M$ a hermitian vector bundle.*

1. *By* $\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{sm}}^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ *we denote the set of those* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ *with*

$$A_k \in C^\infty([0,\varepsilon), \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu-k}(E_N)).$$

2. $\mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ *is the set of those* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}_0^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ *with*

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^k(A_l(x) - A_l(0))\|_{H^{\mu-l}(E_N)\to H^0(E_N)} &= O(x^\delta),\ x \to 0, \\ \|D^k(A_l(x)^t - A_l(0)^t)\|_{H^{\mu-l}(E_N)\to H^0(E_N)} &= O(x^\delta),\ x \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

*for some* $\delta > 0$ *and* $0 \le k \le l$.

The definition of $\mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(E)$ is motivated by the geometrical operators on conformally conic manifolds. In [B3] the operators in $\mathrm{Diff}^{1,1}$ have been investigated.

We note some simple properties of the MELLIN derivative $D = -X\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ on $\mathbf{R}_+$.

**Lemma 1.1.12** *Denote by $X$ the operator of multiplication by the function $x$.*

1.

$$\begin{aligned} D^t &= -D + I, \quad DX^\sigma = X^\sigma(D - \sigma) \\ D^t X^\sigma &= X^\sigma(D^t + \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

2. *There are numbers $a_{kl}, b_{kl} \in \mathbf{Z}$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} D^k &= \sum_{l=1}^{k} a_{kl} X^l (\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^l, \quad a_{kk} = (-1)^k, \\ X^k (\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k &= \sum_{l=1}^{k} b_{kl} D^l, \quad b_{kk} = (-1)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, one easily checks:

**Lemma 1.1.13** 1. *If* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(E)\,(\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{sm}}^{\mu,\nu}(E))$ *then* $P^t \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(E)\,(\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{sm}}^{\mu,\nu}(E))$, *too, and*

$$\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P^t)(z) = (\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(1 - \nu - \overline{z}))^t.$$

*The adjoint on the right hand side is taken with respect to the scalar product in* $L^2(E_N)$.

2. *If* $P_1 \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{sm}}^{\mu,\nu}(E)$, $P_2 \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{sm}}^{\mu',\nu'}(E)$ *then* $P_1P_2 \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{sm}}^{\mu+\mu',\nu+\nu'}(E)$ *and*

$$\sigma_M^{\mu+\mu',\nu+\nu'}(P_1P_2)(z) = \sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_1)(z + \nu')\sigma_M^{\mu',\nu'}(P_2)(z).$$

For later purposes, we summarize the most important properties of the MELLIN transform.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a HILBERT space. For a function $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{H})$, the MELLIN *transform* is defined by

$$Mf(z) := \int_0^\infty x^{z-1} f(x)dx, \quad z \in \mathbf{C}. \tag{1.16}$$

$Mf$ is an entire holomorphic function taking values in $\mathcal{H}$. The following relations hold

$$\begin{aligned} M(Df)(z) &= z\, Mf(z), \\ M(X^\gamma f)(z) &= Mf(z+\gamma), \\ M(\log \cdot f)(z) &= \frac{d}{dz} Mf(z). \end{aligned} \tag{1.17}$$

The inversion formula is

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_\lambda} x^{-z} Mf(z)dz \tag{1.18}$$

for arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$. If $L^{2,\gamma}(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{H})$ denotes the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{H})$ with respect to the scalar product

$$(f|g) = \int_0^\infty (f(x)|g(x))_{\mathcal{H}}\, x^{-2\gamma} dx, \tag{1.19}$$

then $M$ extends to an isometry

$$M_\gamma : L^{2,\gamma}(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow L^2(\Gamma_{1/2-\gamma}, \mathcal{H}, \frac{|dz|}{2\pi}). \tag{1.20}$$

I. e. we have

$$\|f\|_{2,\gamma}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{1/2-\gamma}} \|Mf(z)\|^2 |dz|.$$

The following characterization of the space $L^{2,\gamma}([0,R], \mathcal{H})$ turns out to be useful sometimes.

**Lemma 1.1.14** [RS, Thm. 1.1.5] *A function $f : \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathcal{H}$ belongs to $L^{2,\gamma}([0,R], \mathcal{H})$ if and only if $Mf$ has a holomorphic extension to the half plane $\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma,\infty}$ and*

$$\|Mf\|_{L^2(\Gamma_a)} \le C R^{\gamma + a - \frac{1}{2}}, \quad a > \frac{1}{2} - \gamma$$

*holds.*

We finish this section with some basic facts about differential operators. Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold, $E, F$ hermitian vector bundles over $M$ and

$$D : C_0^\infty(E) \longrightarrow C_0^\infty(F)$$

a differential operator of order $d$. We consider $D$ as an unbounded operator $L^2(E) \to L^2(F)$ and put

$$D_{\min} := \overline{D} = \text{closure } D, \quad D_{\max} := (D^t)^*, \tag{1.21}$$

where $D^t$ denotes the formal adjoint. The domain of an operator will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}$.

We use Sobolev spaces in the terminology of [Sh, Sec. I.7] with one exception: If $M$ is a compact manifold with boundary and $E \to M$ a hermitian vector bundle, we put

$$H^k(E) := \{f \in L^2(E) \mid Df \in L^2(E) \text{ for all } D \in \operatorname{Diff}^k(E)\}.$$

By $H_0^k(E)$ be denote the closure of $C_0^\infty(M \setminus \partial M, E)$ in $H^k(E)$.

Note that in general any $D \in \operatorname{Diff}^d(E)$ extends by continuity to an operator

$$D : H^s_{\mathrm{comp/loc}}(E) \longrightarrow H^{s-d}_{\mathrm{comp/loc}}(E).$$

Here, $H^s_{\mathrm{comp}}$ denotes the Sobolev space with compact support, resp. $H^s_{\mathrm{loc}}$ denotes the space of sections which are locally of Sobolev class $s$. These spaces carry a natural locally convex topology.

In the sequel the following well–known lemma will be used implicitly many times.

**Lemma 1.1.15** *Let $D \in \operatorname{Diff}^d(E)$.*

1. *If $f \in H^d_{\mathrm{comp}}(E)$ is of Sobolev class $d$ with compact support then $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$.*
2. *If $D$ is elliptic, $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(M)$, then we have $\varphi f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$.*

**Remark** If $d = 1$, the ellipticity assumption can be omitted in the second statement. This is easily checked by means of a Friedrichs mollifier.

**Proof** 1. Let $U$ be a neighborhood of supp $f$. Then we can find a sequence $f_n \in C_0^\infty(U, E)$ which converges to $f$ in $H^d_{\mathrm{comp}}(E)$. Since $D$ is continuous $H^d_{\mathrm{comp}}(E) \longrightarrow L^2(E)$ $f_n$ converges to $f$ in the graph topology of $D$ and we reach the conclusion.

2. Since $D$ is elliptic and $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$, elliptic regularity implies $f \in H^d_{\mathrm{loc}}(E)$ and thus $\varphi f \in H^d_{\mathrm{comp}}(E) \subset \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$ by 1. □

**Lemma 1.1.16** *Let $D \in \operatorname{Diff}^d(E)$ be elliptic and $\varphi \in C^\infty(M)$ a bounded function such that* supp $d\varphi$ *is compact.*

1. *The operator of multiplication by $\varphi$, $M_\varphi$, is continuous*

$$\mathcal{D}(D_{\mathrm{max/min}}) \to \mathcal{D}(D_{\mathrm{max/min}}).$$

2. *If $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$,* supp $f$ *compact, then for each neighborhood $U \supset$* supp $f$ *there exists a sequence $(f_n) \subset C_0^\infty(U, E)$ such that $f_n \to f$ with respect to the graph norm of $D$.*

**Proof** 1. First we show that $M_\varphi$ maps the space $\mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$ into itself. Then the first assertion follows from the closed graph theorem. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$, $g \in C_0^\infty(M, E)$, and $\chi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ with $\chi|(\operatorname{supp}[D, \varphi]) \equiv 1$. Then, by elliptic regularity, $\chi f \in H^d_{\mathrm{comp}}(M, E)$ and, because $\operatorname{ord}([D, \varphi]) \le d - 1$, we have $\chi f \in \mathcal{D}([D, \varphi]_{\min})$ by the preceding lemma. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
(\varphi f | D^t g) &= (f | \varphi D^t g) \\
&= (f | [\varphi, D^t] g) + (f | D^t \varphi g) \\
&= ([D, \varphi]_{\min} \chi f | g) + (\varphi D_{\max} f | g),
\end{aligned}$$

thus $\varphi f \in \mathcal{D}((D^t)^*) = \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$ and

$$D \varphi f = \varphi D_{\max} f + [D, \varphi]_{\min} \chi f.$$

2. We note that $f \in H^d_{\mathrm{comp}}(M, E)$, since supp $f$ is compact and $D$ is elliptic. Hence, by the preceding lemma we have $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$, i.e. there exist $g_n \in C_0^\infty(M, E)$ with $g_n \to f$ in the graph norm of $D$. Now we choose $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ with $\varphi|\operatorname{supp} f \equiv 1$. In view of the proven part 1., $f_n := \varphi g_n$ does the job. □

An important theme of this book will be the (singular) elliptic estimate (cf. Section 1.4). The classical elliptic estimate will be used in the following form.

**Lemma 1.1.17** *Let $D \in \mathrm{Diff}^d(E)$ be elliptic.*

1. *Let $K \subset M$ be compact with smooth boundary and $U \supset K$ an open neighborhood. Then there is a constant $C > 0$, such that for $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$*

$$\|f\|_{H^d(K,E)} \le C(\|f\|_{L^2(U,E)} + \|Df\|_{L^2(U,E)}).$$

2. *Let $d > \frac{m}{2}$, $K \subset M$ be compact and $U \supset K$ an open neighborhood. Then we have $\mathcal{D}(D_{\max}) \subset C(M, E)$ and*

$$|f(x)| \le C_K(\|f\|_{L^2(U,E)} + \|Df\|_{L^2(U,E)})$$

*for $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$ and $x \in K$.*

*If $(D_\xi)_{\xi \in X}$ is a $C^\infty$ family of elliptic operators over the compact parameter manifold $X$, the constants in* 1. *and* 2. *can be chosen independently of the parameter $\xi$.*

**Proof** 1. We choose $\psi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ with $\psi \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of $K$. Since $D$ is elliptic, there are pseudodifferential operators $Q, C$ of order $-d$ resp. $-\infty$, whose SCHWARTZ kernels have compact support in $U \times U$, such that

$$QD = \psi + C.$$

Since $\psi$ has compact support, w. l. o. g. we may assume that $\overline{U}$ is compact with smooth boundary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{H^d(K,E)} &= \|\psi f\|_{H^d(K,E)} \le \|\psi f\|_{H_0^d(U,E)} \\ &\le \|QDf\|_{H_0^d(U,E)} + \|Cf\|_{H_0^d(U,E)} \\ &\le \|Q\|_{L^2 \to H_0^d} \|Df\|_{L^2(U,E)} + \|C\|_{L^2 \to H_0^d} \|f\|_{L^2(U,E)}. \end{aligned}$$

2. We can enlarge $K$ such that it has a smooth boundary. Then we apply 1. and the Sobolev embedding theorem to reach the conclusion.

If $D_\xi$ depends smoothly on a parameter, the construction of the pseudodifferential operators $Q_\xi$, $C_\xi$ [Sh, Sec. 5] shows that they also depend smoothly on $\xi$ and the assertion follows. □

Finally we state the main local theorem about the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel.

**Theorem 1.1.18** *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold, $\Delta_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$ a non–negative elliptic differential operator of order $d$, and $\Delta \ge 0$ a self–adjoint extension.*

*Moreover, let $G$ be a compact* LIE *group acting isometrically on $M$. Furthermore, assume that $E$ has a compatible $G$–action, i. e. $g \in G$ is covered by a bundle isometry*

$$g^* : E_{gx} \longrightarrow E_x.$$

*Let $\Delta$ be $G$–equivariant. Then the following holds*

1. *The operator $e^{-t\Delta}$ has a $C^\infty$–kernel*

$$e^{-\cdot\Delta}(\cdot,\cdot) \in C^\infty((0,\infty) \times M \times M, E \boxtimes E^*).$$

2. *If* $K_1, K_2 \subset M$ *are compact with* $K_1 \cap K_2 = \emptyset$ *then*

$$\|e^{-t\Delta}(\cdot,\cdot)\|_{C^k(K_1\times K_2, E\boxtimes E^*)} = O_N(t^N),\ t\to 0$$

*for all* $k, N \in \mathbf{N}$.

3. *Let* $K \subset M$ *be compact,* $G$*–invariant, and denote by* $N_1, \cdots, N_k$ *the components of the fixed point set* $M^g$ *of* $g$*, which intersect* $K$*,* $m_j := \dim N_j$*. Then there is an asymptotic expansion, uniformly over* $K$*,*

$$\operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-t\Delta})(\xi,\xi)) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{j,n}(\xi)\, t^{\frac{n-m_j}{d}}, \tag{1.22}$$

*where the* $\Phi_{j,n}$ *are smooth distributions with support on* $N_j$*, i. e. there exist* $\varphi_{j,n} \in C^\infty(N_j)$*, such that for* $\psi \in C_0^\infty(M)$

$$< \Phi_{j,n}, \psi >= \int_{N_j} \varphi_{j,n}(\xi)\psi(\xi) d\xi.$$

*In particular, for* $G$*–invariant functions* $\varphi, \psi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ *the operator* $g^*(\varphi e^{-t\Delta}\psi)$ *is trace class and*

$$\operatorname{Tr}(g^*(\varphi e^{-t\Delta}\psi)) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{N_j} \varphi(\xi)\psi(\xi)\varphi_{j,n}(\xi) d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-m_j}{d}},$$

**Supplement** $\Phi_{j,n} = 0$ *if* $n \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 2)$*:*
*In particular, if* $M$ *is oriented,* $\dim M \equiv 1(\mathrm{mod}\ 2)$ *and* $g$ *is orientation preserving, then the coefficient of* $t^0$ *in the expansion* (1.22) *vanishes.*

Except the supplement, this theorem belongs to the standard repertoire of the analysts [G, 1.6–1.8]. For $G = 1$, the supplement is [G, Lemma 1.7.4 d], for arbitrary compatible Dirac operators [BGV, Theorem 6.11]. It seems that for general differential operators the supplement has not been considered so far. However, it follows easily from a careful analysis of [G, Sec. 1.8] and hence we do not want to reproduce it here.

## 1.2 Weighted Sobolev Spaces

In this section we briefly introduce the relevant Sobolev spaces for conical singularities. A new result is an estimate near the boundary (Proposition 1.2.8) from which we derive an embedding theorem with asymptotics (Corollary 1.2.9).

Recall from the previous section the notation $N^\wedge := (0,\infty)\times N$. In this section $D$ denotes again the Mellin derivative $-X\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$.

**Lemma 1.2.1** *Let* $N$ *be a compact manifold and* $\Delta_N \in \mathrm{Diff}^2(N, E)$ *be a non–negative elliptic differential operator of order* 2*. Then the operator* $\Delta^k := (D^tD + \Delta_N)^k$ *is essentially self–adjoint in* $C_0^\infty(N^\wedge, E) \subset L^2(N^\wedge, E)$ *for* $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$.

**Proof** We choose an orthonormal basis $(\phi_j)$ of $L^2(N,E)$ with $\Delta_N\phi_j = \lambda_j\phi_j, \lambda_j \geq 0$. We have to show that the deficiency indices of $\Delta^k$ vanish. Hence we consider $f \in \mathcal{D}((\Delta^k)^*), (\Delta^k)^* f = \varepsilon f, \varepsilon = \pm i$. We decompose $f$ with respect to $(\phi_j)$

$$f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_j \otimes \phi_j\,, \quad f_j(x) = (\phi_j | f(x))$$

and obtain immediately

$$f_j \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+), \quad (D^t D + \lambda_j)^k f_j = \varepsilon f_j. \tag{2.1}$$

Consequently, it suffices to consider the scalar case $N = \{pt\}$.

We remark that the equation

$$(-z^2 + z + \lambda_j)^k = \varepsilon$$

has $2k$ distinct roots $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{2k}$. Consequently

$$x^{\alpha_j}, j = 1, \cdots, 2k,$$

is a fundamental system of the differential equation (2.1). Thus (2.1) has no nontrivial square integrable solution on $\mathbf{R}_+$.

The last statement is clear, because $\Delta_N \geq 0$ and $D^t D \geq \frac{1}{4}$, which can be shown easily using the MELLIN transform. □

Before defining the Sobolev spaces, we first state a simple lemma about positive operators whose proof will be omitted.

**Lemma and Definition 1.2.2** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a* HILBERT *space and $T \geq 0$ a self–adjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}$. We put*

$$\mathcal{D}^\infty(T) := \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{D}(T^k)$$

*and, for $x, y \in \mathcal{D}^\infty(T)$ and $s \in \mathbf{R}$,*

$$(x|y)_s := ((I+T)^s x | (I+T)^s y).$$

*Let $\mathcal{H}_T^s$ be the completion of $\mathcal{D}^\infty(T)$ with respect to $\| \cdot \|_s$. Then for $s < s'$ we have a continuous embedding $\mathcal{D}_T^s \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_T^{s'}$ and the scalar product $(\cdot|\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{D}^\infty(T) \times \mathcal{D}^\infty(T)$ extends to an antidual pairing*

$$\mathcal{H}_T^{-s} \times \mathcal{H}_T^s \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}.$$

By complex interpolation theory [T, Sec. I.4] we now have for $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\theta \in [0,1]$

$$[\mathcal{H}_T^{s_1}, \mathcal{H}_T^{s_2}]_\theta = \mathcal{H}_T^{\theta s_2 + (1-\theta)s_1}. \tag{2.2}$$

Consequently we obtain the following simple continuity criterion.

**Lemma 1.2.3** *Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{D}^\infty(T)$ be a simultaneous core for $T^s, s \in \mathbf{R}$, and $(k_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}} \subset \mathbf{R}, k_j \nearrow \infty$. Let $P, P^t : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{H}$ be formal adjoints, i. e. for $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$ the following holds*

$$(Px|y) = (x|P^t y).$$

*If there exist constants $C_j$, such that for $x \in \mathcal{E}$*

$$\|Px\|_{k_j+l}, \|P^t x\|_{k_j+l} \le C_j \|x\|_{k_j},$$

*then for every $s \in \mathbf{R}$ there exists a $C_s$, such that for $x \in \mathcal{E}$*

$$\|Px\|_{s+l}, \|P^t x\|_{s+l} \le C_s \|x\|_s,$$

*i. e. $P, P^t$ have continuous extensions $\mathcal{H}^s_T \to \mathcal{H}^{s+l}_T$.*

**Proof** By [T, Theorem I.4.1] the assertion is true for $s \ge k_0$, by duality also for $s \le -k_0$. Again interpolation yields the assertion for $s \in [-k_0, k_0]$, too. □

**Definition 1.2.4** *We put for $s \in \mathbf{R}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{s,0}(N^\wedge, E) &:= \mathcal{H}^{s/2}_\Delta, \\ \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) &:= X^\gamma \mathcal{H}^{s,0}(N^\wedge, E), \end{aligned}$$

*where the scalar products in $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$ are defined by*

$$(f|g)_{s,\gamma} := (X^{-\gamma} f | X^{-\gamma} g)_{s,0} := (\Delta^{s/2}(X^{-\gamma} f) | \Delta^{s/2}(X^{-\gamma} g))_{L^2(N^\wedge, E)}. \tag{2.3}$$

The last definition makes sense, because $\Delta \ge \frac{1}{4}$. It is easy to check that another choice of $\Delta_N$ yields the same spaces with equivalent norms.

**Lemma 1.2.5** *$C_0^\infty(N^\wedge, E)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$ for $s \in \mathbf{R}_+, \gamma \in \mathbf{R}$.*

**Proof** Since $X^\gamma : \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma} \to \mathcal{H}^{s,0}$ is an isometry, which maps $C_0^\infty(N^\wedge, E)$ into itself, it suffices to prove the assertion for $\gamma = 0$. For $s/2 \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ this is the statement of Lemma 1.2.1. For real $s/2$ the assertion follows by interpolation. □

We find for $f, g \in \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$

$$\begin{aligned} &(f|g)_{s,\gamma} = (\Delta^{s/2}(X^{-\gamma} f) | \Delta^{s/2}(X^{-\gamma} g))_{0,0} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}} ((M(\Delta^{s/2} X^{-\gamma} f))(z) | (M(\Delta^{s/2} X^{-\gamma} g))(z))_{L^2(E)} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}} ((1-z)z + \Delta_N)^{s/2} (Mf)(z-\gamma) | ((1-z)z + \Delta_N)^{s/2} (Mg)(z-\gamma)) dz, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

such that we could have defined $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$ also in this way (cf. [Sch2, Sec. 1.1.1]). Thus our definition is compatible with the definition in loc. cit.

Let $M$ be a compact manifold with conic singularities and $E \to M$ a hermitian vector bundle. We choose a non–negative elliptic differential operator of order 2, $\Delta_M$, on $E$ such that

$$\Delta_M | U = D^t D + \Delta.$$

$\Delta_M$ also is essentially self–adjoint (cf. Section 4.2). Moreover let $\varrho \in C^\infty(M)$ with

$$\varrho > 0, \quad \varrho(x, p) = x \quad \text{for} \quad x \in U.$$

**Definition 1.2.6** *We put for* $s \in \mathbf{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^{s,0}(M,E) &:= \mathcal{H}^{s/2}_{\Delta_M}, \\ \mathcal{K}^{s,\gamma}(M,E) &:= \varrho^\gamma \mathcal{K}^{s,0}(M,E), \end{aligned}$$

*where the scalar products are defined analogously to* (2.3) *by*

$$(f|g)_{s,\gamma} := (\varrho^{-\gamma} f|\varrho^{-\gamma} g)_{s,0} := (\Delta_M^{s/2}(\varrho^{-\gamma} f)|\Delta_M^{s/2}(\varrho^{-\gamma} g))_{L^2(E)}.$$

**Lemma 1.2.7** $C_0^\infty(E)$ *is dense in* $\mathcal{K}^{s,\gamma}(M,E)$ *for* $s \in \mathbf{R}_+, \gamma \in \mathbf{R}$.

**Proof** The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 1.2.5. □

We turn back to the model cone $N^\wedge = \mathbf{R}_+ \times N$.

**Proposition 1.2.8** *Let* $s \geq 1$. *Then there exists a constant* $C$ *such that for* $f \in \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$ *the following holds:* $f(x) \in H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(N,E)$ *and*

$$\|f(x)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(N,E)} \leq Cx^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}\|f\|_{s,\gamma}.$$

**Proof** That $f(x) \in H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(N,E)$ is a consequence of the so-called trace theorem [T, Theorem I.3.5]. However, we will not use loc. cit. and give an elementary proof of this fact. Obviously, it suffices to prove the assertion for $\gamma = 0$.

Let $(\phi_j)$ be an orthonormal basis of $L^2(N,E)$ with $\Delta_N \phi_j = \lambda_j \phi_j, \lambda_j \geq 0$. If $f \in C_0^\infty(N^\wedge, E)$, we have a representation

$$f = \sum_{j=0}^\infty f_j \otimes \phi_j\,, \quad f_j(x) = (\phi_j|f(x))$$

in $L^2(N^\wedge, E)$. We have

$$\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} f = \sum_{j=0}^\infty ((D^t D + \lambda_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_j) \otimes \phi_j =: \sum_{j=0}^\infty g_j \otimes \phi_j.$$

The inversion formula (1.18) of the Mellin transform yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(x) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}} x^{-z}((1-z)z + \lambda_j)^{-\frac{1}{2}} M g_j(z)dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbf{R}} x^{-\frac{1}{2}-i\xi}(\xi^2 + \frac{1}{4} + \lambda_j)^{-\frac{1}{2}} M g_j(\frac{1}{2} + i\xi)d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

hence by Cauchy–Schwarz

$$|f_j(x)| \leq cx^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\lambda_j + \frac{1}{4})^{-\frac{1}{4}}\|g_j\|.$$

Since $\Delta_N$ is elliptic, the $H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}$ norm on $E$ is equivalent to the graph norm of the operator $\Delta_N^{\frac{s}{2}-\frac{1}{4}}$. Consequently we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f(x)\|^2_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(N,E)} &\le c_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\lambda_j + \frac{1}{4})^{s-\frac{1}{2}} |f_j(x)|^2 \\
&\le c_2 x^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\lambda_j + \frac{1}{4})^{s-1} \|(D^tD + \lambda_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} f_j\|^2 \\
&\le c_3 x^{-1} \|(D^tD + \Delta_N)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\|^2 \\
&\le c_3 x^{-1} \|f\|^2_{s,0}.
\end{aligned}$$

The assumption $s \ge 1$ was used in the penultimate inequality.

Since $C_0^\infty(N^\wedge, E)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$, we have shown that

$$i_x : \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \to H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(N, E), \quad f \mapsto f(x)$$

is continuous with $\|i_x\| \le c x^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}$ and we are done. □

**Corollary 1.2.9** (Embedding theorem) *If* $s > \frac{m}{2}$ *then* $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \subset C(N^\wedge, E)$. *Moreover, there exists a* $C$, *such that for* $f \in \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$

$$|f(x,p)| \le C x^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{s,\gamma}.$$

**Proof** Since $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \subset H^s_{\rm loc}(N^\wedge, E)$, the first assertion follows from the classical Sobolev embedding theorem. Moreover we have $s - \frac{1}{2} > \frac{\dim N}{2}$ and loc. cit. yields

$$|f(x,p)| \le C \, \|f(x)\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(N,E)},$$

and the assertion follows from the preceding proposition. □

**Proposition 1.2.10** 1. $P \in \mathrm{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ *has a continuous extension* $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \to \mathcal{H}^{s-\mu,\gamma-\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ *for every* $s, \gamma \in \mathbf{R}$.

2. *Let* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E), \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}), \gamma \in \mathbf{R}$. *Then the operator* $P\varphi$ *extends by continuity to a linear operator* $\mathcal{H}^{\mu,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \to \mathcal{H}^{0,\gamma-\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$. *More precisely, there is a* $C > 0$, *such that*

$$\|P\varphi f\|_{0,\gamma-\nu} \le C \|\varphi f\|_{\mu,\gamma}.$$

3. *If even* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\rm sm}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$, *then the operator* $P\varphi$ *has a continuous extension* $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \to \mathcal{H}^{s-\mu,\gamma-\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ *for arbitrary* $s \in \mathbf{R}$.

4. *For* $\sigma \ge 0, \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ *the operator* $X^\sigma \varphi$ *has a continuous extension* $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E) \to \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma}(N^\wedge, E)$. *In particular we have for* $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$

$$\varphi \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma_2}(N^\wedge, E) \subset \mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma_1}(N^\wedge, E).$$

*If* supp $\varphi \subset [0, r]$ *then*

$$\|X^\sigma \varphi f\|_{0,\gamma} \le r^\sigma \|\varphi\|_\infty \|f\|_{0,\gamma}.$$

**Proof** 1. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Pf\|^2_{s-\mu,\gamma-\nu} &= \|X^{\nu-\gamma}Pf\|^2_{s-\mu,0} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}} \|R^{s-\mu}(z)\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(z-\gamma)(Mf)(z-\gamma)\|^2_{L^2(E)}|dz| \\
&\leq c\int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}} \|R^{s}(z)(Mf)(z-\gamma)\|^2_{L^2(E)}|dz| \\
&= c\|f\|_{s,\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

2. It suffices to consider $P = X^{-\nu}A(x)D^k, A(x) \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu-k}(E_N)$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P\varphi f\|^2_{0,\gamma-\nu} &= \|X^{-\gamma}A(x)D^k\varphi f\|^2_{0,0} \\
&= \int_0^\infty \|x^{-\gamma}A(x)(D^k\varphi f)(x)\|^2_{L^2(E_N)}dx \\
&\leq \sup_{x\in\mathrm{supp}\,\varphi}\|A(x)\|_{H^{\mu-k}\to H^0}\int_0^\infty \|(\frac{1}{4}+\Delta_N)^{\frac{\mu-k}{2}}x^{-\gamma}(D^k\varphi f)(x)\|^2_{L^2(E_N)}dx \\
&= C\|(\frac{1}{4}+\Delta_N)^{\frac{\mu-k}{2}}X^{-\gamma}(D^k\varphi f)\|^2 \\
&\leq C\|\Delta^{\frac{\mu-k}{2}}X^{-\gamma}(D^k\varphi f)\|^2 \\
&= C\|D^k\varphi f\|_{\mu-k,\gamma} \\
&\leq C\|\varphi f\|_{\mu,\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

3. We use Lemma 1.2.3. By Lemma 1.1.13 we have $(D^tD+\Delta_N)^kP \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu+2k,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}$ for $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Hence by 2. the assertion follows for $s = \mu+2k$. If $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}), \psi \equiv 1$ on supp $\varphi$, we can write $(P\varphi)^t = Q\psi$ with suitable $Q \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}$. Then $(P\varphi)^t$ is continuous $\mathcal{H}^{s,\gamma} \to \mathcal{H}^{s-\mu,\gamma-\nu}$ for these $s$, too. Now Lemma 1.2.3 yields the assertion.

4. The proof is analogous to the proof of 3. □

## 1.3 The Parametrix Construction

In this section we construct parametrices for elliptic differential operators of FUCHS type near the boundary. This has important consequences for an elliptic differential operator of FUCHS type on a compact manifold with conic singularities: the space of closed extensions is finite dimensional and all closed extensions are FREDHOLM operators. Moreover, a global GÅRDING inequality can be deduced for these operators. The following definition is due to SCHULZE [Sch2, Sec. 1.1.4].

**Definition 1.3.1** *Let $N$ be a compact manifold and $E$ a hermitian vector bundle over $N$. For $\mu \in \mathbf{R}$ we define $M^\mu(N,E)$ to be the space of all meromorphic functions $a(z)$ on $\mathbf{C}$ with values in $L^\mu_{\mathrm{cl}}(N,E)$, the classical pseudodifferential operators of order $\mu$ [Sh, Sec. I.3.7], having the following properties:*

(i) *For $c, c' \in \mathbf{R}$ the number of poles of $a$ in the strip $\Gamma_{c,c'}$ is finite.*

(ii) *For $z_0 \in \mathbf{C}$, the principal part of the Laurent expansion of $a$ about $z_0$ is of the form*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m_{z_0}} R_{z_0k}(z-z_0)^{-(k+1)} \tag{3.1}$$

*with smoothing operators $R_{z_0k} \in C^\infty(E \boxtimes E^*)$ of finite rank.*

(iii) *If $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbf{C})$, $\chi \equiv 0$ in a neighborhood of the poles of $a$ in $\Gamma_{c,c'}$, and $\chi(z) = 1$ for $|z|$ large enough, then*

$$(\chi a)(\beta + i\tau) \in L^\mu_{\mathrm{cl}}(E; \mathbf{R}_\tau)$$

*uniformly for $\beta \in [c, c']$. Here, $L^\mu_{\mathrm{cl}}(E;\mathbf{R}_\tau)$ denotes the space of parameter dependent classical pseudodifferential operators with parameter $\tau \in \mathbf{R}$ [Sh, Sec. II.9].*

*We put*

$$\mathrm{spec}\,(a) := \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid a \text{ is not holomorphic in } z\}. \tag{3.2}$$

For $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$, we also write $\mathrm{spec}\,(\sigma^{\mu,\nu}_M(P))$ instead of $\mathrm{spec}\,(\sigma^{\mu,\nu}_M(P)^{-1})$. This is compatible with Proposition and Definition 1.1.9.

**Example** If $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$, we certainly have $\sigma^{\mu,\nu}_M(P) \in M^\mu(N,E)$. If $P$ is elliptic, then also $\sigma^{\mu,\nu}_M(P)^{-1} \in M^{-\mu}(N,E)$ by Proposition and Definition 1.1.9.

**Definition 1.3.2** *Let $a \in M^\mu(N,E)$ and $\mathrm{spec}\,(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda} = \emptyset$. Then we put for $f \in C^\infty_0(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(N,E)) \cong C^\infty_0(N^\wedge, E)$*

$$Q^{\nu,\lambda}(a)f := M^{-1}_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda}(a(Mf)(\cdot + \nu)).$$

*For elliptic $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ we put*

$$Q^\lambda(P) := Q^{\nu,\lambda}(\sigma^{\mu,\nu}_M(P)^{-1}),$$

*if $\mathrm{spec}\,(\sigma^{\mu,\nu}_M(P)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda} = \emptyset$.*

First of all we consider the formal adjoints of these operators in $L^2(N^\wedge, E)$.

**Lemma 1.3.3** *The formal adjoints in $L^2(N^\wedge, E)$ are given by*

1. *$Q^{\nu,\lambda}(a)^t = Q^{\nu,\nu-\lambda}(a(\cdot + \nu - 2\lambda)^*)$.*
2. *$Q^\lambda(P^t)^t = Q^{\nu-\lambda}(P)$ for $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$.*

**Proof** 1. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
(Q^{\nu,\lambda}f|g) &= \int_0^\infty x^{-2\lambda}(M^{-1}_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda}(a(Mf)(\cdot+\nu))(x)|x^{2\lambda}g(x))dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda}} ((Mf)(z+\nu)|a(z)^*(Mg)(z+2\lambda))dz \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}+\lambda-\nu}} ((Mf)(z-2\lambda+2\nu)|a(z-2\lambda+\nu)^*(Mg)(z+\nu))dz \\
&= \int_0^\infty x^{2\lambda-2\nu}(x^{-2\lambda+2\nu}f(x)|M^{-1}_{\frac{1}{2}+\lambda-\nu}(a(\cdot-2\lambda+\nu)^*(Mg)(\cdot+\nu))(x))dx \\
&= (f|Q^{\nu,\nu-\lambda}(a(\cdot-2\lambda+\nu)^*)g).
\end{aligned}$$

2. Using Lemma 1.1.13 the assertion is an easy consequence of 1. □

**Definition 1.3.4** *For $a \in M^\mu(N,E)$ we define $r_a(z_0) \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ as follows: if*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m_{z_0}} R_{z_0k}(z-z_0)^{-(k+1)}$$

*is the principal part of the Laurent expansion about $z_0$, then*

$$T : \bigoplus_{l=0}^{m_{z_0}} L^2(E) \to \bigoplus_{l=0}^{m_{z_0}} L^2(E), \quad (Tf)_l := \sum_{k=l}^{m_{z_0}} R_{z_0k} f_{k-l}$$

*is an operator of finite rank and we put $r_a(z_0) := \operatorname{rank}(T)$.*

**Remark** If $m_{z_0} = 0$, then $r_a(z_0) = \operatorname{rank}(R_{z_00})$. For the operator in (1.11) (cf. (1.14)), a simple calculation shows $r_{\sigma_M^{1,1}(P)^{-1}}(z_0) = \dim V =$ algebraic multiplicity of $z_0$.

**Proposition 1.3.5** *Let $\nu \ge \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \ge 0$ and $a \in M^\mu(N,E)$ with* $\operatorname{spec}(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_j} = \emptyset, j = 1,2$. *Then $Q^{\nu,\lambda_2}(a) - Q^{\nu,\lambda_1}(a)$ is an operator of finite rank. More precisely*

$$\operatorname{rank}(Q^{\nu,\lambda_2}(a) - Q^{\nu,\lambda_1}(a)) = \sum_{z \in \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_1,\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_2}} r_a(z).$$

*For $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(N,E))$ we have*

$$((Q^{\nu,\lambda_1}(a) - Q^{\nu,\lambda_2}(a))f)(x) = \sum_{z \in \operatorname{spec}(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_1,\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_2}} \sum_{l=0}^{m_z} \zeta_{zl}(f) x^{-z} \log^l x$$

*with linear maps $\zeta_{zl} : C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(N,E)) \to \oplus_{k=l}^{m_z} \operatorname{im} R_{zk} \subset C^\infty(N,E)$.*

**Proof** For $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(E))$ we find

$$(Q^{\nu,\lambda_2}(a)f - Q^{\nu,\lambda_1}(a)f)(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\Big(\int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_2}} - \int_{\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_1}}\Big) x^{-z} a(z)(Mf)(z+\nu)dz.$$

Since $(Mf)(\cdot+\nu)|\Gamma_c \in \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_c, C^\infty(N,E))$ decreases rapidly enough at infinity, we may apply the residue theorem and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{z_0 \in \operatorname{spec}(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_1,\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_2}} \operatorname{Res}_{z=z_0}(x^{-z} a(z)(Mf)(z+\nu)) \\ = &\sum_{z_0 \in \operatorname{spec}(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_1,\frac{1}{2}-\lambda_2}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_{z_0}} \operatorname{Res}_{z=z_0} x^{-z}(z-z_0)^{-(k+1)} R_{z_0k}(Mf)(z+\nu). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(Mf)(\cdot+\nu)$ is an entire holomorphic function, we find the inner sum to be

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=0}^{m_{z_0}} R_{z_0k} \frac{1}{k!}\Big(\frac{d}{dz}\Big)^k x^{-z}(Mf)(z+\nu)|_{z=z_0} \\ = \;&\sum_{k=0}^{m_{z_0}} R_{z_0k} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{l=0}^{k} \binom{k}{l} (-1)^l (Mf)^{(k-l)}(z_0+\nu) x^{-z_0} \log^l x \\ = \;&\sum_{l=0}^{m_{z_0}} \left( \sum_{k=l}^{m_{z_0}} \frac{(-1)^l}{l!(k-l)!} R_{z_0k} (Mf)^{(k-l)}(z_0+\nu) \right) x^{-z_0} \log^l x \\ =: \;&\sum_{l=0}^{m_{z_0}} \zeta_{z_0l}(f) x^{-z_0} \log^l x. \end{aligned}$$

From this all assertions follow. □

Furthermore, the proof shows that $\zeta_{zl}$ has a continuous extension $L^{2,\lambda_1}([0,x_0]\times N,E)\to\oplus_{k=l}^{m_z}\mathrm{im}\,R_{zk}\subset C^\infty(N,E)$ for arbitrary $x_0\in\mathbf{R}_+$. (cf. Lemma 1.1.14).

**Lemma 1.3.6** *Let $a\in M^\mu(N,E),\nu\geq\lambda\geq 0$. If* $\mathrm{spec}\,(a)\cap\Gamma_{\frac12-\lambda}=\emptyset$*, the operator $Q^{\nu,\lambda}(a)$ has a continuous extension*

$$\mathcal{H}^{s,\lambda-\nu}(N^\wedge,E)\to\mathcal{H}^{s-\mu,\lambda}(N^\wedge,E)$$

*for all $s,\gamma\in\mathbf{R}$.*

*In particular, for $\varphi\in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, the operator $Q^{\nu,\lambda}\varphi$ has a continuous extension $\mathcal{H}^{s,0}\to\mathcal{H}^{s-\mu,\lambda}$.*

**Proof** For $f\in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+,C_0^\infty(N,E))$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|Q^{\nu,\lambda}(a)f\|^2_{s-\mu,\lambda}&=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac12-\lambda}}\|R^{s-\mu}(z)a(z)(Mf)(z+\nu)\|^2_{L^2(E)}|dz|\\&\leq\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac12-\lambda}}\|R^{s-\mu}(z)a(z)R^{-s}(z+\lambda)\|\|R^s(z+\lambda)(Mf)(z+\nu)\|^2_{L^2(E)}|dz|\\&\leq\frac{c}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{\frac12}}\|R^s(z)(Mf)(z+\nu-\lambda)\|^2_{L^2(E)}|dz|=c\|f\|^2_{s,\lambda-\nu}.\end{aligned}$$

The second assertion is a consequence of Proposition 1.2.10. ☐

Now we turn to the case $\mathrm{spec}\,(a)\cap\Gamma_{\frac12-\nu}\neq\emptyset$. In order to do this we need the following (cf. [BS3, Lemma 2.1]):

**Lemma 1.3.7** *For* $\mathrm{Re}\,\alpha=\frac12-\nu,k\in\mathbf{Z}_+$ *let*

$$K:C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)\to C^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+),\quad (Kf)(x):=\int_x^\infty(\frac{x}{y})^{-\alpha}y^{\nu-1}\log^k(\frac{x}{y})f(y)dy.$$

*Suppose $\varphi\in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$ and $0<\varepsilon<\nu$, then $K\varphi$ extends by continuity to an operator $\mathcal{H}^{s,0}(\mathbf{R}_+)\to\mathcal{H}^{s+1,\nu-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Moreover, for $\delta>0$ there is a $c(\delta)$, such that for $0<x\leq\delta$*

$$|(K\varphi f)(x)|\leq x^{\nu-\frac12}\Big\{|\log x|^{k+\frac12}(\int_0^\delta|f(y)|^2dy)^{\frac12}+c(\delta)|\log x|^k\|f\|_2\Big\}.$$

**Proof** One checks that for $0<\varepsilon<\nu$,

$$Kf=Q^{\nu,\nu-\varepsilon}(a)f$$

with

$$a(z)=\frac{(-1)^kk!}{(z-\alpha)^{k+1}}$$

(cf. also (2.1.8)). Now the first assertion is a consequence of Lemma 1.3.6. The inequality is an easy calculation. ☐

Summing up we have:

**Proposition and Definition 1.3.8** *Let* $a \in M^\mu(N,E), \nu > 0$. *We choose* $\varepsilon > 0$, *such that* $\mathrm{spec}\,(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}-\nu+\varepsilon} = \emptyset$ *and put*

$$Q^{\nu,\nu-}(a) := Q^{\nu,\nu-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(a) \quad \text{on} \quad C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(N,E)).$$

*Then, for* $\delta > 0$ *and* $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$, *the operator* $Q^{\nu,\nu-}(a)\varphi$ *has a continuous extension*

$$\mathcal{H}^{s,0}(N^\wedge, E) \to \mathcal{H}^{s,\nu-\delta}(N^\wedge, E).$$

*If*

$$m := \max_{z\in \mathrm{spec}\,(a)\cap\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu}} m_z,$$

*then we have, for* $f \in L^2(N^\wedge, E)$,

$$\|(Q^{\nu,\nu-}(a)\varphi f)(x)\|_{L^2(E)} = o(x^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}|\log x|^{m+\frac{1}{2}}) \tag{3.3}$$

*as* $x \to 0$.

*If* $\mathrm{spec}\,(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu} = \emptyset$ *holds, then* $Q^{\nu,\nu-}(a) = Q^{\nu,\nu}(a)$ *and* (3.3) *can be replaced by* $O(x^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}})$.

*For elliptic* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ *we put*

$$Q^{\min}(P) := Q^{\nu,\nu-}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)^{-1}).$$

*Analogously we put for* $\mathrm{spec}\,(a) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon,\frac{1}{2}} = \emptyset$

$$Q^{\nu,0+}(a) := Q^{\nu,\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(a) \quad \textit{on} \quad C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(N,E)).$$

*Furthermore, for the* $P$ *defined above, put*

$$Q^{\max}(P) := Q^{\nu,\nu+}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)^{-1}).$$

*The adjoints in* $L^2(N^\wedge, E)$ *are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{\nu,\nu-}(a)^* &= Q^{\nu,0+}(a(\cdot-\nu)^*) \\ Q^{\max/\min}(P^t)^* &= Q^{\min/\max}(P). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** We only have to show (3.3), which is an easy consequence of the preceding lemma. □

**Remark** We will see later that (3.3) is the natural generalization of [B3, Corollary 3.2].

In the sequel, let $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$, $\nu > 0$, be a fixed elliptic operator. We decompose

$$P = X^{-\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(x) D^k$$

into

$$P = P_0 + P_1 \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$P_0 = \sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)(D) = X^{-\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(0) D^k$$

and $P_1 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu-\delta}(N^\wedge, E)$. W. l. o. g. we may choose $\delta$ in such a way, that

$$\mathrm{spec}\,(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\delta}) = \emptyset.$$

For convenience we will write $Q^\lambda, Q^{\max/\min}$ instead of $Q^\lambda(P)$, $Q^{\max/\min}(P)$ etc.

**Lemma 1.3.9** *Let* $0 \le \lambda \le \nu$ *such that* $\mathrm{spec}\,(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda} = \emptyset$.

1. *For* $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C_0^\infty(N, E))$ *we have*

$$Q^\lambda P_0 f = f, \quad P_{0,\max} Q^\lambda f = f.$$

2. *Let* $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$ *with* $\varphi \equiv 1$ *near* $0$. *For* $f \in L^2(N^\wedge, E)$ *we have* $Q^\lambda \varphi f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$ *and*

$$P_{0,\max} Q^\lambda \varphi f = \varphi f.$$

*Likewise, for* $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$,

$$Q^{\max} P_{0,\max}(\varphi f) = \varphi f.$$

3. *If* $\psi, \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$, $\psi, \varphi \equiv 1$ *near* $0$, *then* $\mathrm{im}\,(\psi Q^{\min} \varphi) \subset \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min})$.

**Proof** 1. is an easy calculation using the MELLIN transform.

2. For $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C_0^\infty(N, E))$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} (Q^\lambda(P_0)\varphi f | P_0^t g) &= (\varphi f | Q^{\nu-\lambda}(P_0^t) P_0^t g) \\ &= (\varphi f | g) \end{aligned}$$

and the first assertion follows. The second assertion can be shown analogously.

3. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max}^t), g \in L^2(N^\wedge, E)$, and $\chi \in C_0^\infty(N^\wedge)$ with $\chi|\,\mathrm{supp}\,[P_0^t, \psi] \equiv 1$. Note that $[P_0^t, \psi]$ is a differential operator of order $\le \mu - 1$ with compact support and by Lemma 1.1.15

$$\mathrm{im}\,(\chi Q^{\min} \varphi) \subset H^\mu(\mathrm{supp}\ \chi, E) \subset \mathcal{D}([P_0^t, \psi]_{\min}^t) \cap \mathcal{D}(\psi P_{0,\min}) \cap \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min} \psi).$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{0,\max}^t f | \psi Q^{\min} \varphi g) &= -([P_0^t, \psi] f | Q^{\min} \varphi g) + (Q^{\max}(P_0^t) P_{0,\max}^t \psi f | \varphi g) \\ &= -([P_0^t, \psi] f | \chi Q^{\min} \varphi g) + (\psi f | \varphi g) \\ &= (f | [P_0, \psi] Q^{\min} \varphi g) + (\psi f | \varphi g) \\ &= (f | P_{0,\max} \psi Q^{\min} \varphi g) \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. □

**Lemma 1.3.10** 1. *For any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there is an* $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, $\omega \equiv 1$ *near* $0$, *such that, for* $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C_0^\infty(N, E))$,

$$\|P_1 \omega f\|_{0,0} \leq \varepsilon \|P_0 \omega f\|_{0,0}.$$

2. *For any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, *there is an* $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, $\omega \equiv 1$ *near* $0$, *such that*

$$\|\omega P_1 Q^{\min} \psi\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

**Proof** 1. Let $\omega \in C_0^\infty(-1,1)$, $\omega \equiv 1$ near $0$, and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ with $\psi|[-1,1] \equiv 1$. Putting $\omega_n := \omega(n\cdot)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_1 \omega_n f\|_{0,0} &= \|P_1 \psi \omega_n f\|_{0,0} \\
&\leq C\,\|\omega_n f\|_{\mu,\nu-\delta}, && \text{(by Prop. 1.2.10)} \\
&= C\,\|Q^\delta P_0 \omega_n f\|_{\mu,\nu-\delta}, && \text{(by Lemma 1.3.9)} \\
&\leq C'\,\|P_0 \omega_n f\|_{0,-\delta}, && \text{(by Lemma 1.3.6)} \\
&= C'\,\|X^\delta P_0 \omega_n f\|_{0,0} \\
&\leq C'\,n^{-\delta} \|P_0 \omega_n f\|_{0,0}, && \text{(by Prop. 1.2.10).}
\end{aligned}$$

For $n$ large enough, the assertion follows.

2. Analogously, for $f \in L^2(N^\wedge, E)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\omega_n P_1 Q^{\min} \psi f\|_{0,0} &= \|\omega_n X^{\frac{\delta}{2}} X^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} P_1 Q^{\min} \psi f\|_{0,0} \\
&\leq c n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \|\omega_1 P_1 Q^{\min} \psi f\|_{0,\frac{\delta}{2}} \\
&\leq c' n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \|Q^{\min} \psi f\|_{\mu,\nu-\frac{\delta}{2}} \\
&\leq c'' n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \|f\|_{0,0}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

These are the decisive estimates. 1. shows that for $\delta$ small enough, on $(0,\delta) \times N$ the operator $P_1$ is $P_0$–bounded with arbitrary small $P_0$–bound. We are now able to apply the perturbation theory [We, Sec. 5.3].

First, we state a direct consequence of Proposition 1.3.5 and Lemma 1.3.9.

**Proposition 1.3.11** *Let* $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ *near* $0$. *There are continuous linear maps*

$$\sigma_{zl} : \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max}) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{k=l}^{m_z} \operatorname{im} R_{zk} \subset C^\infty(N, E),$$

*such that for* $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$

$$\left[ (\varphi f)(x) - \varphi(x) \sum_{z \in \operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{l=0}^{m_z} \sigma_{zl}(f) x^{-z} \log^l x \right] \in \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min}).$$

*We have*

$$\dim \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max}) / \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min}) = \sum_{z \in \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}}} r_{\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)^{-1}}(z), \tag{3.5}$$

*in particular if* $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}} = \emptyset$

$$\varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max}) = \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min}).$$

*If* $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu} = \emptyset$ *then*

$$\varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min}) = \varphi \mathcal{H}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E).$$

**Proof** Let $\widetilde{\varphi}, \psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}), \widetilde{\varphi}|\operatorname{supp}\varphi \equiv 1, \psi_j|\operatorname{supp}\widetilde{\varphi} \equiv 1$. As a consequence of Lemma 1.3.9 we have $\psi_1 Q^{\min}\psi_2 P_{0,\max}\widetilde{\varphi} f =: f_0 \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min})$ and Proposition 1.3.5 implies

$$\begin{aligned}(\widetilde{\varphi} f)(x) &= (\psi_1 Q^{\max}\psi_2 P_{0,\max}(\widetilde{\varphi} f))(x)\\ &= \psi_1(x) \sum_{z\in\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0))\cap\Gamma_{\frac12-\nu,\frac12}} \sum_{l=0}^{m_z} \sigma_{zl}(f) x^{-z}\log^l x + f_0(x).\end{aligned}$$

Multiplication by $\varphi(x)$ gives the first assertion. The statement about dimensions follows again from Proposition 1.3.5.

If $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac12-\nu} = \emptyset$, then $Q^{\min} = Q^\nu$ and we are done by Lemma 1.3.9 and Lemma 1.3.6. □

**Remark** For the operators in (1.11) the formula (3.5) is [BS3, p. 671 ff].

**Proposition 1.3.12** *Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ near $0$. Then the following is true:*

1. $\varphi\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) = \varphi\mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min})$.
2. *If* $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac12-\nu,\frac12} = \emptyset$ *then*

$$\varphi\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) = \varphi\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}).$$

3. *If* $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)) \cap (\Gamma_{\frac12-\lambda,\frac12} \cup \Gamma_{\frac12-\lambda}) = \emptyset$ *then*

$$\varphi\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) \subset \mathcal{H}^{\mu,\lambda}(N^\wedge, E),$$

*in particular, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$, such that*

$$\varphi\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) \subset \mathcal{H}^{\mu,\varepsilon}(N^\wedge, E).$$

**Proof** Let $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ be chosen according to Lemma 1.3.10 with $\varepsilon = \frac12$ and $\omega \equiv 1$ near 0. Moreover, let supp $\omega$ be small enough such that $\widetilde{P} = P_0 + \omega P_1 \omega$ is elliptic. By the local theory page 18ff, it suffices to prove the proposition for this operator and we write again $P$ instead of $\widetilde{P}$.

1. A simple consequence of the estimate Lemma 1.3.10 is

$$P_{\min} = P_{0,\min} + (\omega P_1 \omega)_{\min}.$$

2. W. l. o. g. assume $\omega$ to be chosen in such a way that $P_1^t\omega$ is also $P_0^t\omega$–bounded with bound $\frac12$. It suffices to prove the following:

(i) $(\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max/\min}$ is $P_{0,\max/\min}$–bounded,
$(\omega P_1^t \omega)_{\max/\min}$ is $P_{0,\max/\min}^t$–bounded.

(ii) $P_{0,\max/\min} + t(\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max/\min}$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max/\min})$ for $0 \le t \le 1$. The corresponding statement holds for the adjoint operators as well.

Namely, by [We, Theorem 5.27] this yields

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\max} = (P^t)^* &= (P^t_{\min})^* = (P^t_{0,\min} + (\omega P_1^t \omega)_{\min})^* \\ &= P_{0,\max} + (\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max} \end{aligned}$$

with domain $\mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$. Thus

$$\varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) = \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max}) = \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min}) = \varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}).$$

It remains to prove (i) and (ii).

(i): $(\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max/\min}$ is closed and since $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}} = \emptyset$ we have $\mathcal{D}((\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max/\min}) \supset \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max/\min})$. Hence (i) is a consequence of [Y, Theorem II.6.2].

(ii): We prove that $P_t := P_{0,\max} + t(\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max}$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$. The other statements are proved similarly. Thus choose $(f_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$, such that $f_n \to f$ and $P_t f_n = P_{0,\max} f_n + t(\omega P_1 \omega)_{\max} f_n$ converges. Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, $\varphi \equiv 1$ near 0, and $\omega\varphi = \varphi$. By Lemma 1.1.16 we also have $\varphi f_n \subset \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$ and $\varphi f_n$ converges in the graph norm of $P_t$. Since $\operatorname{spec}(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)) \cap \Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}} = \emptyset$, we even have $\varphi f_n \subset \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min})$ and, since $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi f_n)$ is small enough, we find

$$\|\omega P_1 \omega \varphi f_n\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|P_0 \varphi f_n\|,$$

thus

$$\|P_0 \varphi f_n\| \leq \|P_t \varphi f_n\| + \|\omega P_1 \omega \varphi f_n\| \leq \|P_t \varphi f_n\| + \frac{1}{2}\|P_0 \varphi f_n\|,$$

i. e. $P_0 \varphi f_n$ converges. Hence we have proved $\varphi f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min})$. From local elliptic regularity it follows that $\psi f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\min})$ for arbitrary $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, in particular for $\psi$ with $\psi | \operatorname{supp} \omega \equiv 1$. But for such $\psi$ we have $P_t(1-\psi) f_n = P_0(1-\psi) f_n$, thus $(1-\psi) f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{0,\max})$ and we are done.

3. If $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ then $\varphi f \in \mathcal{D}((X^{\nu-\lambda} P)_{\max})$ and the assertion is a consequence of 2., 1. and Proposition 1.3.11. □

We state an immediate consequence of these considerations.

**Corollary 1.3.13** (Gårding inequality) *For $\varphi$ as above and $\lambda < \nu$ we have*

$$\varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \subset \varphi \mathcal{H}^{\mu,\lambda}(N^\wedge, E)$$

*and for $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ we have the estimate*

$$\|\varphi f\|_{\mu,\lambda} \leq C(\|\varphi f\|_{0,0} + \|P_{\min} \varphi f\|_{0,0}). \tag{3.6}$$

*If $\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)$ is invertible on $\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu}$, then*

$$\varphi \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) = \varphi \mathcal{H}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$$

*and* (3.6) *also holds for $\lambda = \nu$.*

**Proof** We choose $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$, $\psi | \operatorname{supp} \varphi \equiv 1$, and obtain for $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(N, E))$ and $\lambda < \nu$ (resp. $\leq \nu$)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi f\|_{\mu,\lambda} &= \|Q^{\min} \psi P_0 \varphi f\|_{\mu,\lambda} \\ &\leq c \|P_0 \varphi f\|_{0,0}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 1.3.10 the assertion follows. □

**Corollary 1.3.14** *Let* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\varphi$ *be the same as in Proposition* 1.3.11 3. *We have for* $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$

$$\|\varphi f\|_{\mu,\varepsilon} \le C(\|f\| + \|P_{\max} f\|).$$

*In particular, if* $\operatorname{ord} P > \frac{m}{2}$ *then the inclusion* $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) \subset C(N^\wedge, E)$ *holds, and for* $x_0 > 0$ *there is a* $C_{x_0}$*, such that for* $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max}), x \le x_0, p \in N$

$$|f(x,p)| \le C_{x_0} x^{\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}}(\|f\| + \|P_{\max} f\|).$$

**Proof** The first estimate is equivalent to saying that the map

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) \to \mathcal{H}^{\mu,\varepsilon}(N^\wedge, E), f \mapsto \varphi f$$

is continuous. This follows from the closed graph theorem. The second estimate is a consequence of Proposition 1.2.9 and the first estimate. □

**Lemma 1.3.15** *Let* $P : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(F)$ *be a differential operator between sections of the hermitian vector bundles* $E, F$ *over the Riemannian manifold* $M$*. Assume that* $P_{\min}$ *and* $P_{\max}$ *are* FREDHOLM *operators. Then*

$$\dim \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) = \operatorname{ind} P_{\max} - \operatorname{ind} P_{\min} < \infty$$

*and consequently every closed extension of* $P$ *is a* FREDHOLM *operator.*

**Proof** Consider the inclusion $i : \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$. Since $P_{\min} = P_{\max} \circ i$, $i$ is FREDHOLM and

$$\dim \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) = -\operatorname{ind}(i) = \operatorname{ind} P_{\max} - \operatorname{ind} P_{\min} < \infty. \qquad \square$$

**Proposition 1.3.16** *Let* $M$ *be a compact manifold with conical singularities and* $P \in \operatorname{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(E,F)$*,* $\nu > 0$*, an elliptic operator. Then the closed extensions of* $P$ *are all* FREDHOLM *operators and the space*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$$

*is finite dimensional.*

**Proof** By the preceding lemma, the last assertion is clear, if we can show that $P_{\max/\min}$ are FREDHOLM.

Let $U = (0,\varepsilon) \times N$ be a neighborhood of the boundary. We choose $\omega, \psi \in C_0^\infty([0,\varepsilon))$ according to Lemma 1.3.10 in such a way that

$$\|\omega P_1 Q^{\min} \psi\| < \frac{1}{2}.$$

We may assume that $\omega | \operatorname{supp} \psi \equiv 1$. We may think of $\omega, \psi$ as functions on $M$, extended by 0. Next we choose an interior parametrix $Q_\psi$, such that

$$P Q_\psi = 1 - \psi + K$$

with compact $K$. With

$$Q := Q_\psi + \omega Q^{\min}\psi$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\max/\min}Q &= 1-\psi+K+[P,\omega]Q^{\min}\psi+\omega P_0 Q^{\min}\psi+\underbrace{\omega P_1 Q^{\min}\psi}_{=:R} \\ &= I+K+[P,\omega]Q^{\min}\psi+R. \end{aligned}$$

Since $[P,\omega]$ is a differential operator with compact support of order $\leq \mu-1$, $[P,\omega]Q^{\min}\psi$ is compact. Since $\|R\|<1$, $Q(I+R)^{-1}$ is a right parametrix for $P_{\max/\min}$. Analogously we find a right parametrix for $P^t_{\min/\max}$, whose adjoint then is a left parametrix for $P_{\max/\min}$. □

For the remainder of the section let $M$ be a compact manifold with conic singularities and let $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(M,E)$, $\nu>0$, be an elliptic differential operator.

**Corollary 1.3.17** *We have*

$$\dim \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) = \sum_{z\in\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu,\frac{1}{2}}} r_{\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)^{-1}}(z).$$

**Proof** If near the boundary $P \in \mathrm{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}((0,\varepsilon)\times N, E)$, then the assertion holds by Proposition 1.3.11. On $(0,\varepsilon)\times N$ we decompose $P$ as in (3.4) and choose $\omega \in C_0^\infty([0,\varepsilon))\times N)$, $\omega\equiv 1$ near 0, such that $\widetilde{P} = P-\omega P_1\omega$ remains elliptic. Then

$$\mathrm{ind}(P_{\min}) = \mathrm{ind}(\widetilde{P}_{\min})$$

and analogously

$$\mathrm{ind}(P_{\max}) = -\mathrm{ind}(P^t_{\min}) = -\mathrm{ind}\widetilde{P}^t_{\min} = \mathrm{ind}\widetilde{P}_{\max}.$$

Then by Lemma 1.3.15 we are done. □

**Proposition 1.3.18** (Global Gårding inequality) *For $\lambda<\nu$ there is an inclusion $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \subset \mathcal{K}^{\mu,\lambda}(M,E)$ and there is a $c_\lambda>0$, such that for $f\in\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$*

$$\|f\|_{\mu,\lambda} \leq c_\lambda(\|f\|_{0,0}+\|Pf\|_{0,0}). \tag{3.7}$$

*If* $\mathrm{spec}\,(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P))\cap\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}-\nu}=\emptyset$ *then* $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})=\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\lambda}(M,E)$ *and* (3.7) *also holds in this case.*

**Proof** The assertion is a consequence of Corollary 1.3.13 and the classical Gårding inequality in the interior [G, Lemma 1.3.1]. □

**Proposition 1.3.19** *There is an $\varepsilon>0$, such that $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})\subset\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\varepsilon}(M,E)$. Furthermore, for $f\in\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$,*

$$\|f\|_{\mu,\varepsilon} \leq c(\|f\|_{0,0}+\|Pf\|_{0,0}).$$

**Proof** The inclusion $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})\subset\mathcal{H}^{\mu,\varepsilon}(M,E)$ follows from the corresponding local statement, Lemma 1.3.12. The asserted estimate is equivalent to saying that $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})\hookrightarrow\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\varepsilon}(M,E)$ is continuously embedded. This follows from the closed graph theorem. □

**Corollary 1.3.20** *If* $\operatorname{ord}(P) > \frac{m}{2}$ *then* $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) \subset C(M,E)$. *If* $\varepsilon > 0$ *is chosen as in the preceding proposition then there is a* $c > 0$, *such that for* $f \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$

$$|f(p)| \le c\varrho(p)^{\varepsilon-\frac{1}{2}}(\|f\| + \|Pf\|).$$

**Proof** Near the boundary, the estimate follows from Corollary 1.2.9 and the preceding proposition. This also implies the global estimate. See also Propostion 1.4.3 in the next section. □

## 1.4 The Singular Elliptic Estimate

In this section we are going to axiomize the results of the last section. In the sequel let

> $M$ be a Riemannian manifold, $\dim M = m$, and $U \subset M$ an open subset with smooth compact boundary $N := \partial U$. (4.1)

The philosophy, standing behind this, is to consider $U$ as the "singular part" of $M$; for example $U = (0,\varepsilon) \times N$ in the case of conic singularities.

**Definition 1.4.1** *We put*

$$C_U^\infty(M) := \{\varphi \in C^\infty(M) \mid \operatorname{supp}(\varphi) \cap (M \setminus U) \text{ compact}\}.$$

*A subset* $K \subset M$, $K \supset U$ *will be called (relative)* $U$*–compact, if the quotient space* $K/U$ *is (relative) compact in* $M/U$.

This is equivalent to saying that $K \cap (M \setminus U)$ is (relative) compact.

Let $E$ be a hermitian vector bundle and

$$P_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$$

a symmetric elliptic differential operator of order $\mu$. We will only deal with those closed extensions $P : \mathcal{D}(P) \to L^2(E)$ of $P_0$, for which $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is invariant under multiplication by functions $\varphi \in C_U^\infty(M)$ satisfying $\varphi|U \equiv 1$. This holds true without further assumptions if $M \setminus U$ is compact, because then we have $1 - \varphi \in C_0^\infty(M)$. We assume that in this sense $P_0$ has a self-adjoint extension, $P$, and define

$$\mathcal{KD}(P,U) := \{s \in \mathcal{D}(P) \mid \operatorname{supp} s \subset U, \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} s, \partial U) > 0\}. \tag{4.2}$$

We content ourselves to self–adjoint operators to have the spectral theorem at hand. For an arbitrary operator $P$ one may consider

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \\ P^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the following considerations have to be done for $P$ and $P^*$.

Equipped with the graph norm of $P$, $\mathcal{KD}(P,U)$ becomes a pre–HILBERT space. By extending sections by 0, we have the natural inclusions

$$\alpha : \mathcal{KD}(P,U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(P), \quad i : \mathcal{KD}(P,U) \hookrightarrow L^2(E). \tag{4.3}$$

**Definition 1.4.2** *We say that*

(i) *$P$ has the* RELLICH *property on $U$, if $i$ is compact.*

(ii) *$P$ satisfies the singular elliptic estimate on $U$ (or short: it has the property (SE)), if there is a function $\varrho \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(M) \cap C(M)$, $\varrho > 0$, $\varrho|U \in L^2(U)$ and $l \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that for $x \in U$ and $s \in \mathcal{KD}(P^l, U)$*

$$\text{(SE)} \qquad |s(x)| \leq \varrho(x)(\|s\|_{L^2(U,E)} + \|P^l s\|_{L^2(U,E)}). \tag{4.4}$$

A priori the property (SE) is local in nature. This has the advantage that it has to be verified only locally. At the moment its disadvantage is that a priori, (4.4) is only true for sections with support in $U$. Nevertheless we have

**Proposition 1.4.3** *Let $l\mu > \frac{m}{2}$. Then, for every $U$–compact subset $K \supset U$, there is a $C_K$, such that for $s \in \mathcal{D}(P^l)$ and $x \in K$*

$$|s(x)| \leq C_K \varrho(x)(\|s\| + \|P^l s\|).$$

**Proof** We equip the space

$$C_\varrho(K, E) := \{s \in C(K, E) \mid \sup_{x \in K} \frac{|s(x)|}{\varrho(x)} < \infty\}$$

with the norm

$$\|s\|_\varrho := \sup_{x \in K} \frac{|s(x)|}{\varrho(x)}.$$

With this norm, $C_\varrho(K, E)$ becomes a BANACH space. Since $\varrho \in L^2(K)$, this BANACH space is continously embedded into $L^2(K, E)$. Since $l\mu > m/2$ and by Definition 1.4.2 we have $s|K \in C_\varrho(K, E)$ for $s \in \mathcal{D}(P^l)$. The restriction operator

$$S : \mathcal{D}(P^l) \longrightarrow C_\varrho(K, E)$$

is closable in $L^2(M, E)$. Hence we conclude the assertion from [Y, Theorem II.6.2]. □

Since (4.4) remains certainly true if we enlarge $l$, we assume in the sequel that $l\mu > m/2$. Corollary 1.3.14 shows that on a manifold with conic singularities every closed extension of a symmetric elliptic differential operator $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(M)$ has the property (SE). Of course, this is the example we always have in mind. In the subsection at the end of this section we show that operators of APS type on a compact manifold with boundary also have the property (SE).

**Lemma 1.4.4** *The* RELLICH *property is equivalent to the following statement:*

> *If $(s_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(P)$ is a bounded sequence and $\varphi \in C^\infty_U(M)$, $\varphi|U \equiv 1$, then $(\varphi s_n)$ has a subsequence, which converges in $L^2(E)$.*

**Proof** Assume the RELLICH property holds. Let $(s_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(P)$ be a bounded sequence and $\varphi$ as in the statement. Since $\operatorname{supp}(d\varphi)$ is compact, $[P, \varphi]$ is a differential operator with compact support and hence $(\varphi s_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(P)$ is bounded, too. The RELLICH property states that $(\varphi s_n)$ has a subsequence which converges in $L^2(E)$.

Conversely, assume the statement ist true and let $(s_n) \subset \mathcal{KD}(P, U)$ be bounded. For proving that $(s_n)$ has a subsequence converging in $L^2(E)$, consider $\varphi \in C^\infty_U(M)$, $\varphi|U \equiv 1$. Then $\operatorname{supp}(d\varphi)$ is compact and $\varphi s_n = s_n$ which implies the assertion. □

**Proposition 1.4.5** *Let $f : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ be a measurable function with*

$$|f(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)^{-l},$$

*where – as already mentioned – $l > \frac{m}{2\mu}$. Then $f(P)$ has a measurable kernel, which will be denoted by $f(P)(x,y) \in \mathrm{Hom}(E_y, E_x)$. For $x, y \in U$ the following estimates are true*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_M |f(P)(x,y)|^2 dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \varrho(x)(\|f\|_{\mathrm{spec}\,P} + \|\mathrm{id}^l f\|_{\mathrm{spec}\,P}), \\ |f(P)^2(x,y)| &\leq \varrho(x)\varrho(y)(\|f\|_{\mathrm{spec}\,P} + \|\mathrm{id}^l f\|_{\mathrm{spec}\,P})^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Here $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{spec}\,P}$ denotes the sup–norm over* spec $P$.

*More generally, let $K : L^2(E) \to L^2(E)$ be a linear operator with kernel $k(x,y) \in$* $\mathrm{Hom}(E_y, E_x)$ *and* $(\mathrm{im}\,K) \subset \mathcal{D}(P^l)$. *Then we have for $x, y \in U$*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_M |k(x,y)|^2 dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \varrho(x)(\|K\| + \|P^l K\|), \\ |(KK^*)(x,y)| &\leq \varrho(x)\varrho(y)(\|K\| + \|P^l K\|)^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** That $f(P)$ has a measurable kernel follows from the local Sobolev embedding theorem (cf. [R2, Lemma 5.6]). Now we have for $s \in C_0^\infty(E)$ and $x \in U$

$$\begin{aligned} |(Ks)(x)| &\leq \varrho(x)(\|Ks\| + \|P^l Ks\|) \\ &\leq \varrho(x)(\|K\| + \|P^l K\|)\|s\| \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude the first estimate from the Riesz representation theorem. The second estimate is an immediate consequence of the identity

$$(KK^*)(x,y) = \int_M k(x,z)k(y,z)^* dz$$

and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

Kernel estimates of this type will play an important role throughout this book.

For $f$ as in the proposition and $\varphi, \psi \in C_U^\infty(M)$, this proposition shows that $\varphi f(P), f(P)\psi$ are HILBERT–SCHMIDT operators, thus $\varphi f(P)^2\psi$ is trace class. If $\psi|\,\mathrm{supp}\,\varphi \equiv 1$ then

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\varphi f(P)^2\psi) = \int_M \varphi(x)\mathrm{tr}(f(P)^2(x,x))dx. \tag{4.5}$$

In this book we will write more suggestively $\mathrm{Tr}(\varphi f(P)^2)$. But note that in general, $\varphi f(P)^2$ is not a trace class operator.

For the moment put $\Delta := I + |P|$. $\Delta$ has the property (SE), too.

**Proposition 1.4.6** 1. *Suppose $\varphi \in C_U^\infty(M)$, $\varphi|U \equiv 1$, and $k > \max(\frac{m}{2\mu}, l)$. Then $\varphi\Delta^{-k}$ is a* HILBERT–SCHMIDT *operator.*

2. *The property (SE) over $U$ implies the* RELLICH *property over $U$.*

**Proof** 1. is a direct consequence consequence of the preceding proposition.

2. From $\varphi\Delta^{-k/2}(\varphi\Delta^{-k/2})^* = \varphi\Delta^{-k}\varphi$, which is HILBERT–SCHMIDT, we infer that $\varphi\Delta^{-k/2}$ is 4–summable. By induction, we find that $\varphi\Delta^{-1}$ is $p$–summable for some $p$. Thus $i$ is $p$–summable, in particular compact. □

**Proposition 1.4.7** *Assume $M \setminus U$ to be compact and let $P$ have the property (SE) over $U$. Then $P$ is discrete. Denoting by $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}}$ the sequence of eigenvalues, there exists a $c > 0$, such that we have the a priori estimate*

$$|\lambda_j| \geq c j^{\frac{1}{2l}} \tag{4.6}$$

*for $j \geq j_0$.*

**Remark** Together with Corollary 1.3.14 this gives another proof of Proposition 1.3.16.

**Proof** Since $M \setminus U$ is compact, by Proposition 1.4.3 $P$ has the property (SE) over $M$, too. But then $(I + P^2)^{-1}$ is compact and hence $P$ is discrete. Let $(\phi_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $L^2(E)$ consisting of eigensections of $P$, i. e. $P\phi_j = \lambda_j\phi_j$. Then we compute, using the singular elliptic estimate, for $c_j \in \mathbf{C}, a > 0, x \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} c_j\phi_j(x)\varrho(x)^{-1} \Big| &\leq \Big\| \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} c_j\phi_j \Big\| + \Big\| \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} \lambda_j^l c_j\phi_j \Big\| \\ &\leq (1 + a^l)\Big( \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} |c_j|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

We choose a local orthonormal frame $e_1, \cdots, e_r$ of $E$ and conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} < \phi_j(x), \phi_j(x) > &= \sum_{n=1}^{r} \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} | < e_n(x), \phi_j(x) > |^2 \\ &= \Big| \sum_{n=1}^{r} < e_n(x), \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} < e_n(x), \phi_j(x) > \phi_j(x) > \Big| \\ &\leq r \max_{1\leq n\leq r} \Big| \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} < e_n(x), \phi_j(x) > \phi_j(x) \Big| \\ &\leq \varrho(x) r (1 + a^l)\Big( \sum_{n=1}^{r} \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} | < e_n(x), \phi_j(x) > |^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \varrho(x) r (1 + a^l)\Big( \sum_{|\lambda_j|<a} < \phi_j(x), \phi_j(x) > \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality (4.7) with $c_j =< e_n(x), \phi_j(x) >$. Integrating this estimate we obtain

$$\#\{\lambda_j \,|\, |\lambda_j| \leq a\} \leq r^2(1 + a^l)^2 \int_M \varrho(x)^2 dx \leq c a^{2l}$$

from which the asserted estimate follows. □

This proof is an adaption of the proof of the corresponding statement for classical elliptic operators on a compact manifold [G, Lemma 1.6.3].

Next we deal with heat kernels. Let $P$ be a self–adjoint extension of the symmetric elliptic differential operator $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^\mu(E)$. We put $\Delta := P^2$ and equip

$$H_P^k := \mathcal{D}(\Delta^{\frac{k}{2\mu}})$$

with the graph norm. For a linear operator $K : H^k_P \to H^{k'}_P$ $\|K\|_{k,k'}$ will denote its operator norm. Furthermore, we consider differential operators $A, B \in \mathrm{Diff}(E)$ of order $a, b$, having the properties

$$\text{supp } B \text{ is compact} \tag{4.8}$$

$$\text{supp } [\Delta, A] \text{ is compact} \tag{4.9}$$

$$A \in \mathcal{L}(H^k_P, H^{k-a}_P) \tag{4.10}$$

$$\text{supp } A \cap \text{supp } B = \emptyset \tag{4.11}$$

and put

$$R_{A,B}(t) := Ae^{-t\Delta}B.$$

Our assumptions guarantee, that $R_{A,B}(t) \in \mathcal{L}(H^\alpha_P, H^\beta_P)$ for $t > 0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{R}$. Moreover, the map $(0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto R_{A,B}(t) \in \mathcal{L}(H^\alpha_P, H^\beta_P)$ is strongly continuous.

**Proposition 1.4.8** *For arbitrary $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{R}$ and $N > 0$ we have*

$$\|R_{A,B}(t)\|_{\alpha,\beta} = O(t^N) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to 0.$$

**Proof** As is well–known, this proposition is at least true if supp $A$ is compact, too (Theorem 1.1.18). We will not use this fact but prove it again. Using the spectral theorem, one easily checks that, for $t > 0, \alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, and $r \geq 0$,

$$\|e^{-t\Delta}\|_{\alpha,\alpha+r} = O(t^{-\frac{r}{2\mu}}), \quad t \to 0. \tag{4.12}$$

This and (4.8)–(4.11) implies

$$\|R_{A,B}(t)\|_{\alpha,\alpha-a-b+r} = O(t^{-\frac{r}{2\mu}}), \quad t \to 0. \tag{4.13}$$

Of course the O–constants depend on $A, B, \alpha$. Since

$$(\partial_t + \Delta)R_{A,B} = R_{[\Delta,A],B}, \quad R_{A,B}(0) = 0,$$

DUHAMEL's principle yields

$$R_{A,B}(t) = \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)\Delta} R_{[\Delta,A],B}(s) ds.$$

In view of (4.13) we assume by induction, that we had proved that

$$\|R_{A,B}(t)\|_{\alpha,\alpha-a-b+r} = O(t^N), \quad t \to 0$$

for all $A, B$, satisfying (4.8)–(4.11), and all $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, $0 \leq r \leq r_0$, $0 \leq N \leq N_0$. If $A$ is multiplication by $\varphi \in C^\infty(M)$ and using $\mathrm{ord}\,[\Delta, \varphi] \leq 2\mu - 1$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_{\varphi,B}(t)\|_{\alpha,\alpha-b+r_0+\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \int_0^t \|e^{-(t-s)\Delta}\|_{\alpha,\alpha+2\mu-\frac{1}{2}} \|R_{[\Delta,\varphi],B}(s)\|_{\alpha+2\mu-\frac{1}{2},\alpha-b+r_0+\frac{1}{2}} ds \\
&= O(\int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{1}{4\mu}-1} s^{N_0} ds) \\
&= O(t^{N_0+\frac{1}{4\mu}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Given $A$ arbitrary, we choose $\psi \in C^\infty_0(M)$ with $\psi \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of supp $B$, and $\psi \equiv 0$ in a neighborhood of supp $A$. By putting $\varphi := 1 - \psi$ we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_{A,B}(t)\|_{\alpha,\alpha-a-b+r_0+\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \|A\|_{\alpha,\alpha-a} \|\varphi e^{-t\Delta} B\|_{\alpha-a,\alpha-a-b+r_0+\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= O(t^{N_0+\frac{1}{4\mu}}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 1.4.9** *Assume that $P$ has the property (SE) over $U$. Under the assumptions of Proposition* 1.4.8 *we have, for $N \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ and $x \in U$,*

$$\Big(\int_M |(Ae^{-t\Delta}B)(x,y)|^2 dy\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C\varrho(x)t^N$$

*where the constant $C$ may depend on $A, B, N$.*

**Proof** This is a consequence of the preceding proposition and Proposition 1.4.5. □

We present an application of these considerations. For doing this, we consider two Riemannian manifolds $M_1$,$M_2$, and symmetric elliptic differential operators $P_{j,0} : C_0^\infty(E_j) \to C_0^\infty(E_j)$. Assume there is an isometry

$$F : U_1 \to U_2 \tag{4.14}$$

between open subsets $U_j \subset M_j$ with smooth compact boundary, which lifts to a bundle isometry

$$F_* : E_1|U_1 \to E_2|U_2, \tag{4.15}$$

such that

$$P_{1,0} = F_*^{-1} \circ P_{2,0} \circ F_*, \tag{4.16}$$

where $F_*$ also denotes the induced isometry $L^2(E_1) \to L^2(E_2)$. We identify $U_1$ with $U_2$ and write again $U$. Moreover put

$$E_j|U =: E, \quad P_{j,0}|U =: P_0. \tag{4.17}$$

We choose an open subset, $W \subset U$, with smooth compact boundary, such that $\overline{W} \subset U$ and $U \setminus W$ is relative compact.

Let $P_j$ be self–adjoint extensions of $P_{j,0}$ with the property mentioned before (4.2). Moreover, assume that for $\varphi \in C_W^\infty(U)$, $\varphi|W = 1$,

$$\varphi\mathcal{D}(P_1) = \varphi\mathcal{D}(P_2). \tag{4.18}$$

I. e. we have

$$\mathcal{KD}(P_1, U) = \mathcal{KD}(P_2, U) \tag{4.19}$$

and we put $P := P_1|\mathcal{KD}(P_1, U)$.

**Definition 1.4.10** *The situation* (4.14)–(4.19) *we have just described will be refered to briefly as "$P_1$ and $P_2$ coincide over $U$".*

One easily checks that for arbitrary $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$

$$\mathcal{KD}(P_1^k, U) = \mathcal{KD}(P_2^k, U),$$

and for $\varphi$ as above

$$\varphi\mathcal{D}(P_1^k) = \varphi\mathcal{D}(P_2^k).$$

Now we put $\Delta_j := P_j^2$ and consider cut–off functions $\chi, \psi, \phi \in C^\infty(M_2)$ as follows:

$$\varphi \equiv 0 \text{ in a neighborhood of } \overline{W},\ \varphi \equiv 1 \text{ in a neighborhood of } M_1 \setminus U. \tag{4.20}$$

$\psi$ has the same properties as $\varphi$ and, in addition, $\psi \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of supp $(\varphi)$. (4.21)

$\chi \in C_W^\infty(U)$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of supp $(1-\varphi)$. (4.22)

Now we consider the operator

$$E_t = \chi e^{-t\Delta_1}(1-\varphi) + \psi e^{-t\Delta_2}\varphi$$

acting in $L^2(E_2)$. Obviously, for $x, y \in W$,

$$E_t(x,y) = e^{-t\Delta_1}(x,y).$$

Moreover, $E_0 = \mathrm{Id}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t + \Delta_2)E_t &= [P_0^2, \chi]e^{-t\Delta_1}(1-\varphi) + [P_0^2, \psi]e^{-t\Delta_2}\varphi \\ &=: R_t,\end{aligned}$$

hence DUHAMEL's principle yields

$$E_t = e^{-t\Delta_2} + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2} R_s ds.$$

If $P$ has the property (SE) over $W$, we apply Proposition 1.4.8 and obtain, for $x, y \in W$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|e^{-t\Delta_1}(x,y) - e^{-t\Delta_2}(x,y)\Big| \\ \le\;& \varrho(x)\Big(\Big\|\int_0^t (e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}R_s)(\cdot,y)ds\Big\| + \Big\|\int_0^t (e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}\Delta_2^{l/2}R_s)(\cdot,y)ds\Big\|\Big) \\ \le\;& \varrho(x)\Big(\int_0^t \Big(\int_M |R_s(x,y)|^2 dx\Big)^{\frac12} ds + \int_0^t \Big(\int_M |(\Delta_2^{l/2}R_s)(x,y)|^2 dx\Big)^{\frac12} ds\Big) \\ \le\;& C\varrho(x)\varrho(y)t^N\end{aligned}$$

for arbitrary $N > 0$ and a constant $C$ depending on $N$. The difference $(\Delta_1^k e^{-t\Delta_1})(x,y) - (\Delta_2^k e^{-t\Delta_2})(x,y)$, $k \ge 1$, can be estimated completely analogous. We have proved:

**Theorem 1.4.11** *In the situation described above assume that $P_j$ have the property (SE) over $W$. Then for $N > 0$ there exists a $C > 0$, such that for $x, y \in W$*

$$\Big|(\Delta_1^k e^{-t\Delta_1})(x,y) - (\Delta_2^k e^{-t\Delta_2})(x,y)\Big| \le C\varrho(x)\varrho(y)t^N.$$

This theorem gives a fairly general condition which allows to compute the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel of the operator $\Delta_2$ over $U$ by means of a "model operator" $\Delta_1$. In case of a compact manifold $M_2$ with conic singularities, $M_1$ will be the model cone $N^\wedge$.

### 1.4.1 The Singular Elliptic Estimate for APS Boundary Conditions

In this section we prove the singular elliptic estimate for operators of APS type. The structure of this proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 1.2.8 ff. The computations we have to do are similar to those in [APS, Sec. I.2]. Our only goal is to prove the singular elliptic estimate. We do not claim that the estimates we prove in this section are optimal.

Let $N$ be a compact manifold, $A \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(E)$ a symmetric elliptic operator. On $N^\wedge$ we consider

$$D := \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + A : C^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C^\infty(E)) \longrightarrow C^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C^\infty(E)). \tag{4.23}$$

For $\mu \geq 0$ let

$$\mathcal{D}(D_0^\mu) := \{f \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C^\infty(E)) \mid 1_{[\mu,\infty)}(A)(f(0)) = 0\}. \tag{4.24}$$

Here, $1_{[\mu,\infty)}$ denotes the characteristic function of the set $[\mu,\infty)$ and $1_{[\mu,\infty)}(A)$ is defined by the Borel functional calculus. In fact, $1_{[\mu,\infty)}(A)$ is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace spanned by all eigenvectors to eigenvalues in $[\mu,\infty)$.

Our goal is to prove, that $D^\mu := \overline{D_0^\mu}$ has the property (SE) over $(0,R)\times N$ for arbitrary $R>0$.

First we investigate the one–dimensional situation. For $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ let

$$T_\lambda := \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \lambda : H^1(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+) \longrightarrow L^2(\mathbf{R}_+). \tag{4.25}$$

**Lemma 1.4.12** *For $f \in H^1(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$ we have the following estimates:*

(1) $\lambda^2\|f\|^2 \leq \|T_\lambda f\|^2 + \lambda|f(0)|^2$.

(2) *If $\lambda < 0$ or ($\lambda > 0$ and $f(0) = 0$) then*

$$|f(x)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2|\lambda|}}\|T_\lambda f\|.$$

**Proof** (1) It is well–known that $H^1(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+) \subset C_0(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$, the space of continuous functions vanishing at infinity. Using this, one finds

$$\|T_\lambda f\|^2 = \|f'\|^2 + \lambda^2\|f\|^2 - \lambda|f(0)|^2$$

and (1) is proved.

(2) We find for $\lambda < 0$

$$f(x) = -\int_x^\infty e^{\lambda(y-x)}(T_\lambda f)(y)dy.$$

If $f(0) = 0$ we have

$$f(x) = \int_0^x e^{\lambda(y-x)}(T_\lambda f)(y)dy.$$

In both cases the assertion follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. □

**Proposition 1.4.13** 1. *Let $k \in \mathbf{N}, k \geq 1$. Then there is a $C > 0$, such that for $f \in \mathcal{D}((D^\mu)^k)$*

$$\|f(x)\|_{H^{k-1/2}(E)} \leq C(\|f\| + \|(D^\mu)^k f\|).$$

2. *For arbitrary $s \geq 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}((D^{\mu *} D^\mu)^{s/2})$ one has analogously*

$$\|f(x)\|_{H^{s-1/2}(E)} \leq C(\|f\| + \|(D^{\mu *} D^\mu)^{s/2} f\|).$$

**Proof** Let $(\phi_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $L^2(E)$ consisting of eigensections of $A$, $A\phi_n = \lambda_n \phi_n$. For $f \in \mathcal{D}(D^\mu_0)$ we have

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^\infty f_n \otimes \phi_n$$

in $L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, L^2(E))$. For $\lambda_n < 0$ or $\lambda_n \geq \mu$ the preceding lemma yields

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n(x)| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2|\lambda_n|}} \|T_{\lambda_n} f_n\|, \\ |\lambda_n| \|f_n\| &\leq \|T_{\lambda_n} f_n\|. \end{aligned}$$

If $0 \leq \lambda_n < \mu$ then we apply (2) of the preceding lemma with $\lambda = -1$ and find

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n(x)| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|T_{-1} f_n\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\|f'\| + \|f\|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} ((1 + |\lambda_n|)\|f_n\| + \|T_{\lambda_n} f_n\|). \end{aligned}$$

Since only a finite number of the $\lambda_n$ lie in $[0, \mu)$, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f(x)\|^2_{H^{k-1/2}(E)} \leq C \left( \sum_{0\leq\lambda_n<\mu} |f_n(x)|^2 + \sum_{\lambda_n\geq\mu, \lambda_n<0} (1 + |\lambda_n|)^{2k-1} |f_n(x)|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C' \left( \sum_{0\leq\lambda_n<\mu} \|f_n\|^2 + \|T_{\lambda_n} f_n\|^2 + \sum_{\lambda_n\geq\mu, \lambda_n<0} (1 + |\lambda_n|)^{2k-2} \|T_{\lambda_n} f_n\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C''(\|f\| + \|(D^\mu)^k f\|)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of part 2. is similar. □

In the same way as we concluded Corollary 1.2.9 from Proposition 1.2.8 we derive the following corollary from the preceding proposition:

**Corollary 1.4.14** *Let $k > \frac{m}{2}$ resp. $s > \frac{m}{2}$. Then we have for $f \in \mathcal{D}((D^\mu)^k)$*

$$|f(x, p)| \leq C(\|f\| + \|(D^\mu)^k f\|)$$

*resp. for $f \in \mathcal{D}((D^{\mu *} D^\mu)^{s/2})$*

$$|f(x, p)| \leq C(\|f\| + \|(D^{\mu *} D^\mu)^{s/2} f\|).$$

*In particular, $D^\mu$ has the property (SE) over $(0, R) \times N$ for every $R > 0$.*

# Bibliographic Notes

Differential operators of FUCHS type with scalar coefficients are classical and they occur naturally in a variety of differential equations of mathematical physics.

It is hard to trace back the origin of the use of FUCHS type differential operators in the context of conical singularities. As noted by SCHULZE [Sch1, Sch2], the Russian mathematician KONDRATEV already investigated these operators in the 1960's [K]. Certainly, the seminal work on conical singularities are the papers of CHEEGER [C1, C2, C3].

The author has learned the basic facts about FUCHS type operators on pages 12-18 from SCHULZE and they are taken from an earlier version of [Sch2]. However, we use a slightly different notion of ellipticity than loc. cit. Let $P$ be a FUCHS type operator, elliptic in the sense of Definition 1.1.3. Then Corollary 1.3.13 and Lemma 1.3.19 show that the natural domain of $P_{\min}$ is not a weighted Sobolev space if the MELLIN symbol is not invertible on a certain critical line $\Gamma_{1/2-\nu}$. As a consequence, the restriction of $P$ to the weighted Sobolev space will not be FREDHOLM. SCHULZE avoids this problem by adding the invertibility of the MELLIN symbol on a certain weight line to the definition of ellipticity. Proposition 1.3.16 shows that this is not necessary if one extends operators to their natural domains. However, the price one pays is that these domains are more complicated to describe (cf. (3.3)).

The discussion of maximal and minimal extensions of differential operators on page 18 and Lemmas 1.1.15–1.1.17 are folklore. However, the material might be unfamiliar to those readers who never had to worry about domains of differential operators, because this problem plays no role for elliptic operators on compact manifolds.

Our point of view is a functional analytic one and hence the material is presented in the style of "HILBERT complexes" [BL1, BL2]. We refer to loc. cit. for more details.

The weighted Sobolev spaces we introduce in Section 1.2 can also be found in [Sch1, Sch2]. The trace theorem with asymptotics Proposition 1.2.8 and the embedding theorem with asymptotics Corollary 1.2.9 are probably new.

The parametrix construction in Section 1.3 mimicks techniques for first and second order operators due to BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS2, BS3, B3, B4]. In contrast to loc. cit. we use the MELLIN calculus. So, it is natural that many of the results of Section 1.3 have predecessors for operators of order 1 or 2. (3.3) is the natural generalization of [B3, Corollary 3.2]. Formula (3.5) is a generalization of [BS3, p. 671 ff] where it is stated for the operators of type (1.11). Also Proposition 1.3.16 and Corollary 1.3.17 generalize results of loc. cit.

The notion of "singular elliptic estimate" in Section 1.4 is new. In the meantime the content of this section has been published in a slightly different form in [L3].

# CHAPTER II

# Asymptotic Expansions

## Summary

The decisive property of FUCHS type operators is their *scalability* on the real axis resp. on the model cone. On the model cone there is a natural unitary action of the multiplicative group $\mathbf{R}_+$, namely

$$\mathbf{R}_+ \ni \lambda \mapsto U_\lambda, \quad (U_\lambda f)(x) := \sqrt{\lambda} f(\lambda x).$$

Given

$$L = X^{-\nu} \sum_{n=0}^{\mu} A_k(x)\Big( - X \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)^k$$

one finds

$$U_\lambda L U_\lambda^* = \lambda^{-\nu} L_\lambda, \quad L_\lambda := X^{-\nu} \sum_{n=0}^{\mu} A_k(\lambda x)\Big( - X \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big)^k.$$

For the heat kernel of $L$, this implies (Lemma 2.2.3)

$$e^{-tL}(x,x) = \frac{1}{x} e^{-tx^{-\nu} L_x}(1,1). \tag{1}$$

To expand $\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-tL})$ for $t \to 0$ we basically have to consider

$$\int_0^\infty \varphi(x) \frac{1}{x} \mathrm{Tr}(e^{-tx^{-\nu} L_x}(1,1)) dx =: z \int_0^\infty \varphi(x) \sigma(x, xz) dx \tag{2}$$

where $\varphi$ is a cut–off function near 0, $z := t^{-1/\nu}$, and

$$\sigma(x,\zeta) = \frac{x}{\zeta} \mathrm{Tr}(e^{-\zeta^{-\nu} L_x}(1,1)).$$

Now, to the right hand side of (1) we can apply the interior asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel. However, what we get is an asymptotic expansion of $\sigma(x,\zeta)$ as $\zeta \to \infty$. The problem is the argument $xz$ in (2) since we are interested in the asymptotic expansion as $z \to \infty$ and $x$ varies from 0 to $\infty$.

The appropriate tool for deriving asymptotic expansions of integrals like (2) is the so–called "singular asymptotics lemma" (SAL) of BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS1].

Asymptotic expansions of integrals like (2) have been applied to different types of problems by several authors [CU, Ca2]. A fairly general version of these results is SAL.

In Section 2.1 we will give a comprehensive exposition of the SAL. We will generalize this lemma to cover finite asymptotic expansions with remainder term. Since it is indispensable to deal with regularized integrals, we decided to add a discussion of regularized integrals based on the MELLIN transform. This leads to a systematic treatment of certain versions of the results mentioned above in a slightly more general form.

In Section 2.2 we exploit the above mentioned scaling property. We introduce invariants of the MELLIN symbol via $\zeta$– and $\eta$–functions. These invariants will show up as coefficients in the expansion of the heat trace and in the index formula.

It seems to be impossible to evaluate these invariants in general. However, for certain second order operators this is possible and it will be worked out in Section 2.3.

The main results of this chapter are the asymptotic expansion of the heat trace of an elliptic FUCHS type operator and an index theorem. These results are stated in Section 2.4.

Finally, we would like to point out that we consider the whole situation to be equivariant. Although this does not have any excitingly new features we hope that it will have applications in the future, for example in a Lefschetz–type theorem for conical singularities.

## 2.1 The Singular Asymptotics Lemma

First we introduce a space of functions whose MELLIN transform is meromorphic in a strip.

**Definition 2.1.1** *Let* $p, q \in \mathbf{R}$, $p, q > 0$. *We denote by* $\mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ *the class of all functions* $f \in \mathcal{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=0}^{m_j^0} a_{jk}\, x^{\alpha_j}\, \log^k x + x^p f_1(x), && (1.1)\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{k=0}^{m_j^\infty} b_{jk}\, x^{\beta_j}\, \log^k x + x^{-q} f_2(x), && (1.2) \end{aligned}$$

*with* $f_1 \in \mathcal{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}([0,\infty)), f_2 \in \mathcal{L}^1([1,\infty))$. *Here,* $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in \mathbf{C}, (\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha_j)$ *increasing,* $(\mathrm{Re}\ \beta_j)$ *decreasing, and* $\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha_j \le p-1, \mathrm{Re}\ \beta_j \ge -q-1$.

Moreover, we put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{spec}_0(f) &:= \{\alpha_j \,|\, j = 0, \cdots, N\}, && (1.3)\\ \mathrm{spec}_\infty(f) &:= \{\beta_j \,|\, j = 0, \cdots, M\}. && (1.4) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\infty,q}(\mathbf{R}_+) &:= \bigcap_{p>0} \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+),\\ \mathcal{L}_{p,\infty}(\mathbf{R}_+) &:= \bigcap_{q>0} \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+),\\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+) &:= \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\infty}(\mathbf{R}_+) := \bigcap_{p>0} \mathcal{L}_{p,\infty}(\mathbf{R}_+) = \bigcap_{q>0} \mathcal{L}_{\infty,q}(\mathbf{R}_+). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel we will omit the subscript $j$ in $\alpha_j, \beta_j$ wherever possible. Instead we will write for (1.1)

$$f(x) = \sum_{\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha \le p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha^0} a_{\alpha k}\, x^\alpha \, \log^k x + x^p f_1(x). \tag{1.5}$$

Here $a_{\alpha k}$ is different from 0 at most for $\alpha \in \operatorname{spec}_0(f)$. Likewise for (1.2).

We would like to extend the MELLIN transform to $\mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. For that purpose we note that for $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ and $\mathrm{Re}\,(z) > -\min\{\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha \,|\, \alpha \in \operatorname{spec}_0(f)\}$, the function

$$x \mapsto x^{z-1} f(x)$$

is locally integrable on $[0, \infty)$. Moreover, in view of (1.5) we have for any $c > 0$

$$M(f 1_{[0,c]})(z) = \sum_{\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha \le p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha^0} a_{\alpha k} \int_0^c x^{z+\alpha-1} \, \log^k x dx + \int_0^c x^{z+p-1} f_1(x) dx.$$

Integration by parts yields

$$\int_0^c x^{z+\alpha-1} \, \log^k x dx = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{k-j} k!}{j!} c^{z+\alpha} \, \log^j c \, (z+\alpha)^{j-k-1}. \tag{1.6}$$

Thus the function

$$M(f 1_{[0,c]})(z) = \int_0^c x^{z-1} f(x) dx$$

has a meromorphic continuation to the half plane $\Gamma_{1-p,\infty}$ with poles of order $m_\alpha^0 + 1$ in $-\alpha, \alpha \in \operatorname{spec}_0(f)$. We denote this function by $M(f 1_{[0,c]})(z)$, too. We proceed similarly with $f 1_{[c,\infty]}$ and obtain

**Proposition and Definition 2.1.2** *For $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+), p, q > 0$ and $z \in \Gamma_{1-p,1+q}$ the* MELLIN *transform is defined to be*

$$Mf(z) := M(f 1_{[0,c]})(z) + M(f 1_{[c,\infty]})(z),$$

*where $c > 0$ is arbitrary. $Mf$ is independent of the $c$ chosen and it is a meromorphic function in $\Gamma_{1-p,1+q}$. $Mf$ has at most poles of order $\le m_\alpha^0 + 1$ ($m_\beta^\infty + 1$) in $-\alpha, \alpha \in$ $\operatorname{spec}_0(f)$ ($-\beta, \beta \in \operatorname{spec}_\infty(f)$). If $\alpha \in \operatorname{spec}_0(f) \setminus \operatorname{spec}_\infty(f)$, the pole $-\alpha$ is present and has order $m_\alpha^0 + 1$. For $\beta \in \operatorname{spec}_\infty(f) \setminus \operatorname{spec}_0(f)$ the analogous statement holds.*

The following example shows that in fact poles may cancel out: Obviously the function

$$f_{\alpha k}(x) := x^\alpha \log^k x \tag{1.7}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. One easily checks that (cf. (1.6))

$$M(f_{\alpha k} 1_{[0,1]})(z) = \frac{(-1)^k k!}{(z+\alpha)^{k+1}} \tag{1.8}$$

and

$$M(f_{\alpha k} 1_{[1,\infty]})(z) = \frac{(-1)^{k+1} k!}{(z+\alpha)^{k+1}}, \tag{1.9}$$

thus one has

$$M(f_{\alpha k})(z) = 0. \tag{1.10}$$

**Definition 2.1.3** 1. *For a meromorphic function $f$ we denote by $\operatorname{Res}_k f(a)$ the coefficient of $(z-a)^{-k}$ in the Laurent–expansion of $f$ about $a$, i.e.*

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=-m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Res}_{-k} f(a)(z-a)^k.$$

*The ordinary residue is sometimes denoted by* Res *instead of* $\operatorname{Res}_1$*.*

2. *For $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ we put*

$$⨍_0^\infty f(x)dx := \operatorname{Res}_0(Mf)(1).$$

Clearly, $⨍_0^\infty$ is a linear functional on $\mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$, which coincides with the ordinary integral on $\mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+) \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbf{R}_+)$.

(1.8)–(1.10) imply immediately

$$\begin{aligned} ⨍_0^1 x^\alpha \log^k x dx &= \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha = -1, \\ \frac{(-1)^k k!}{(\alpha+1)^{k+1}}, & \alpha \neq -1, \end{cases} && (1.11a) \\ ⨍_1^\infty x^\alpha \log^k x dx &= \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha = -1, \\ \frac{(-1)^{k+1} k!}{(\alpha+1)^{k+1}}, & \alpha \neq -1, \end{cases} && (1.11b) \end{aligned}$$

in particular we have the somewhat strange but important formula

$$⨍_0^\infty x^\alpha \log^k x dx = 0. \tag{1.12}$$

There exist some significant differences between $⨍$ and the ordinary integral. For example, the change of variables is more complicated, as the following lemma shows.

**Lemma 2.1.4** *For $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ and $\lambda > 0$ we have the "change of variables rule"*

$$⨍_0^\infty f(\lambda x)dx = \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(⨍_0^\infty f(x)dx + \sum_{k=0}^{m_{-1}^\infty} b_{-1,k}\frac{\log^{k+1}\lambda}{k+1} - \sum_{k=0}^{m_{-1}^0} a_{-1,k}\frac{\log^{k+1}\lambda}{k+1}\right).$$

*Here, $a_{-1,k}, b_{-1,k}$ are the coefficients of $x^{-1}\log^k x$ in the notation of* (1.5).

**Proof** We choose cut–off functions $\varphi, \psi \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+)$ satisfying

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \le 1 \\ 0, & x \ge 2 \end{cases}, \quad \psi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \ge 2 \\ 0, & x \le 1 \end{cases}. \tag{1.13}$$

Then

$$f(x) - \varphi(x) \sum_{\operatorname{Re}\alpha \le p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha^0} a_{\alpha k} x^\alpha \log^k x - \psi(x) \sum_{\operatorname{Re}\beta \ge -q-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\beta^\infty} b_{\beta k} x^\beta \log^k x \tag{1.14}$$

is integrable on $\mathbf{R}_+$. Thus it suffices to consider functions of the form

$$\varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x \quad \text{resp.} \quad \psi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x.$$

With $f(x) = \varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x$ we have on the one hand, for $\mathrm{Re}\, z > -\mathrm{Re}\, \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned}
M(f(\lambda.))(z) &= \int_0^\infty x^{z-1}\varphi(\lambda x)(\lambda x)^\alpha \log^k(\lambda x)dx \\
&= \lambda^{-z}\int_0^\infty x^{z-1}\varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx \\
&= \lambda^{-z}\left(\int_0^1 x^{z+\alpha-1}\log^k x dx + \int_1^\infty x^{z-1}\varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx\right) \\
&= \lambda^{-z}\left(\frac{(-1)^k k!}{(z+\alpha)^{k+1}} + \int_1^\infty x^{z-1}\varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the second summand is an entire holomorphic function of $z$, this yields

$$\fint_0^\infty f(\lambda x)dx = \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\left(\frac{(-1)^k k!}{(1+\alpha)^{k+1}} + \int_1^\infty \varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx\right), & \alpha \neq -1, \\ \lambda^{-1}\left(-\frac{\log^{k+1}\lambda}{k+1} + \int_1^\infty \varphi(x)x^{-1}\log^k x dx\right), & \alpha = -1. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand we have, for $\mathrm{Re}\, z > -\mathrm{Re}\, \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^{-1}Mf(z) &= \lambda^{-1}\int_0^\infty \varphi(x)x^{z+\alpha-1}\log^k x dx \\
&= \lambda^{-1}\left(\int_0^1 x^{z+\alpha-1}\log^k x dx + \int_1^\infty \varphi(x)x^{z+\alpha-1}\log^k x dx\right) \\
&= \lambda^{-1}\left(\frac{(-1)^k k!}{(z+\alpha)^{k+1}} + \int_1^\infty \varphi(x)x^{z+\alpha-1}\log^k x dx\right),
\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\lambda^{-1}\fint_0^\infty f(x)dx = \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\left(\frac{(-1)^k k!}{(1+\alpha)^{k+1}} + \int_1^\infty \varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx\right), & \alpha \neq -1, \\ \lambda^{-1}\int_1^\infty \varphi(x)x^{-1}\log^k x dx, & \alpha = -1, \end{cases}$$

and the assertion is proved for $f(x) = \varphi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x$. Next consider $f(x) = \psi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x$. In view of (1.12) this case can be reduced to the previous one:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_0^\infty \psi(\lambda x)(\lambda x)^\alpha \log^k(\lambda x)dx = -\fint_0^\infty (1-\psi)(\lambda x)(\lambda x)^\alpha \log^k(\lambda x)dx \\
&= \begin{cases} -\lambda^{-1}\fint_0^\infty (1-\psi)(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx, & \alpha \neq -1, \\ -\lambda^{-1}\left(\fint_0^\infty (1-\psi)(x)x^{-1}\log^k x dx - \dfrac{\log^{k+1}\lambda}{(k+1)}\right), & \alpha = -1, \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\fint_0^\infty \psi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x dx, & \alpha \neq -1, \\ \lambda^{-1}\left(\fint_0^\infty \psi(x)x^{-1}\log^k x dx + \dfrac{\log^{k+1}\lambda}{(k+1)}\right), & \alpha = -1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

On the other hand, the change of variables by a power of $x$ is as usual:

**Lemma 2.1.5** *Let $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+), \sigma \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have*

$$⨍_0^\infty f(x^\sigma)dx = \frac{1}{|\sigma|} ⨍_0^\infty f(y) y^{\frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma}} dy.$$

This reads as follows: If one side of the equation is well–defined, then the other is also well–defined and the formula holds.

**Proof** The proof is entirely analogous to the proof of Lemma 2.1.4. □

For completeness, we are going to introduce another characterization of $⨍$.

**Definition 2.1.6** *Let $p, q > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. We define the regularized limit by*

$$\operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to 0} f(x) := a_{00} = \text{coefficient of } x^0 \log^0 x \text{ in the expansion (1.1)}$$

*and*

$$\operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to \infty} f(x) := b_{00} = \text{coefficient of } x^0 \log^0 x \text{ in the expansion (1.2).}$$

**Proposition 2.1.7** *Let $p, q > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the function*

$$F(x) := \int_1^x f(y)dy$$

*lies in $\mathcal{L}_{p+1-\varepsilon,q+1-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ and we have for any $c > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} ⨍_0^c f(x)dx &= F(c) - \operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to 0} F(x), \\ ⨍_c^\infty f(x)dx &= \operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to\infty} F(x) - F(c), \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

*in particular*

$$⨍_0^\infty f(x)dx = \operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to\infty} F(x) - \operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to 0} F(x). \tag{1.16}$$

**Proof** That $F \in \mathcal{L}_{p+1-\varepsilon,q+1-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ is fairly obvious. It suffices to check (1.15) for the $f_{\alpha k}$ (cf. (1.7)) and $c = 1$. We have (cf. (1.6))

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\alpha k}(x) &= \int_1^x f_{\alpha k}(y)dy \qquad (1.17) \\ &= \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^{k-j}k!}{j!} x^{\alpha+1} \log^j x\, (\alpha+1)^{j-k-1} + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}k!}{(\alpha+1)^{k+1}}, & \alpha \neq -1, \\ \displaystyle\frac{1}{k+1} \log^{k+1} x, & \alpha = -1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

comparing this with the formulas (1.11a,b) yields

$$⨍_0^1 f_{\alpha k}(x)dx = F_{\alpha k}(1) - \operatorname*{LIM}_{x\to 0} F_{\alpha k}(x).$$

Similarly one proves $0 = ⨍_1^\infty f_{\alpha k}(x)dx = \operatorname{LIM}_{x\to\infty} F_{\alpha k}(x) - F_{\alpha k}(1)$. □

Now we come to a first version of a singular asymptotics:

**Proposition 2.1.8** *Let* $F \in \mathcal{L}_{p,q}(\mathbf{R}_+), p, q > 0$ *and* $\varphi$ *in the* Schwartz *space* $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R})$. *Then as* $t \to 0$ *the following asymptotic expansion holds*

$$\begin{aligned} {\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_0^\infty \varphi(tx)F(x)dx \quad &\sim_{t\to 0} \quad \sum_{j<q} \frac{\varphi^{(j)}(0)}{j!} {\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_0^\infty x^j F(x)dx\, t^j \qquad (1.18) \\ &+ \quad \sum_{\substack{\beta\in\mathrm{spec}_\infty(F)\\ \mathrm{Re}\,\beta\geq -q-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\beta^\infty} b_{\beta k} {\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_0^\infty \varphi(x)x^\beta \log^k(x/t)dx\, t^{-\beta-1} \\ &+ \quad \sum_{\substack{\beta\in\mathrm{spec}_\infty(F)\cap\mathbf{Z}\\ -q-1\leq \mathrm{Re}\,\beta\leq -1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\beta^\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}\varphi^{(-\beta-1)}(0)}{(-\beta-1)!} b_{\beta k} \frac{\log^{k+1}(t)}{k+1}\, t^{-\beta-1} \\ &+ \quad O(t^q). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** First we assume that $\mathrm{id}^q F \in L^1[1,\infty)$ and that for $N \in \mathbf{Z}_+$, $q-1 < N \leq q$, we have $N + \mathrm{Re}\,\alpha_0 > -2$, where $\mathrm{Re}\,\alpha_0 = \min\{\mathrm{Re}\,\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in \mathrm{spec}_0(F)\}$. We write

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\varphi^{(j)}(0)}{j!} x^j + x^{N+1}\psi(x)$$

with $\psi \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+), \psi(x) = O(x^{-1}), x \to \infty$. Our choice of $N$ implies that the function $\psi(t\cdot)\mathrm{id}^{N+1}F$, $t > 0$, is integrable on $\mathbf{R}_+$ and we obtain

$${\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_0^\infty \varphi(tx)F(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\varphi^{(j)}(0)}{j!} {\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_0^\infty x^j F(x)dx\, t^j + t^{N+1} \int_0^\infty \psi(tx)x^{N+1}F(x)dx.$$

Furthermore, we have for $t \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} t^{N+1} \int_0^\infty |\psi(tx)x^{N+1}F(x)|dx \quad &= \quad O(t^{N+1}) + O(\int_1^{1/t} x^{N+1-q}(x^q F(x))dx\, t^{N+1}) \\ &\quad +O(\int_{1/t}^\infty x^{N-q}(x^q F(x))dx\, t^N) \\ &= \quad O(t^q), \quad t \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Lemma 2.1.9 below.

For arbitrary $F$ we write

$$F(x) =: \psi(x) \cdot \sum_{\substack{\alpha\in\mathrm{spec}_0(F)\\ \mathrm{Re}\,\alpha\leq -q-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha^0} a_{\alpha k} x^\alpha \log^k x + \sum_{\substack{\beta\in\mathrm{spec}_\infty(F)\\ \mathrm{Re}\,\beta\geq -q-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\beta^\infty} b_{\beta k} x^\beta \log^k x + F_1(x)$$

with a cut–off function $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+), \psi \equiv 1$ near 0. The function $F_2(x) := \psi(x)x^\alpha \log^k x$ lies in $\mathcal{L}_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ and the above considerations yield

$$\fint_0^\infty \varphi(tx)F_2(x)dx = \sum_{j=0}^{M} \frac{\varphi^{(j)}(0)}{j!} \fint_0^\infty x^j F_2(x)dx\, t^j + O(t^{M+1}), \quad t \to 0,$$

for $M > -2 - {\rm Re}\,\alpha$. $F_1$ also satisfies the above assumptions, and it suffices to prove the proposition for

$$F(x) = x^\beta \log^k x, \quad \beta \in \mathbf{C},\ k \in \mathbf{Z}_+.$$

But in this case the assertion reduces to the change of variables rule

$$\fint_0^\infty \varphi(tx)x^\beta \log^k x dx = t^{-\beta-1} \fint_0^\infty \varphi(x)x^\beta \log^k(x/t)dx,$$

for $\beta \notin \{-1,-2,\cdots\}$. If $\beta \in \{-1,-2,\cdots\}$, then

$$\fint_0^\infty \varphi(tx)x^\beta \log^k x dx = t^{-\beta-1}\big(\tfrac{(-1)^{k+1}\varphi^{(-\beta-1)}(0)}{(-\beta-1)!}\tfrac{\log^{k+1} t}{k+1} + \fint_0^\infty \varphi(x)x^\beta \log^k(\frac{x}{t})dx\big). \qquad \Box$$

**Lemma 2.1.9** *Let $f \in L^1[1,\infty)$. Then for $0 < \alpha \le 1$*

$$\int_1^x y^\alpha f(y)dy = O(x^\alpha), \quad x \to \infty$$

*and for $0 \le \alpha < 1$*

$$\int_x^\infty y^{-\alpha} f(y)dy = O(x^{-\alpha}), \quad x \to \infty.$$

**Proof** Put $F(x) := \int_1^x f(y)dy = O(1), x \to \infty$. Integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}\int_1^x y^\alpha f(y)dy &= x^\alpha F(x) - \alpha \int_1^x y^{\alpha-1}F(y)dy \\ &= O(x^\alpha) + O(\int_1^x y^{\alpha-1}dy) = O(x^\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\int_x^\infty y^{-\alpha} f(y)dy = x^{-\alpha}F(x) + O(\int_x^\infty y^{-\alpha-1}dy) = O(x^{-\alpha}). \qquad \Box$$

The preceding proof justifies to some extent the introduction of the regularized integral. The obvious advantage of this notion is that we do not have to worry about the existence of certain integrals in the sense of Lebesgue. This gives us some more freedom. Other proofs of Proposition 2.1.8 are more complicated. In the literature one often finds variants of the integral (1.18). By change of variables, they can be reduced to the situation above. Applying Lemma 2.1.4 we find

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_0^\infty \varphi(x)F(x/t)dx &= t \fint_0^\infty \varphi(tx)F(x)dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in {\rm spec}_0(F)\cap\mathbf{Z} \\ {\rm Re}\,\alpha<0}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha^0} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}\varphi^{(-\alpha-1)}(0)}{(-\alpha-1)!} a_{\alpha k} \frac{\log^{k+1}(t)}{k+1} t^{-\alpha},\end{aligned}$$

thus

**Corollary 2.1.10** *Under the assumptions of Proposition* 2.1.8 *we have, as* $t \to 0$*, the asymptotic expansion*

$$\begin{aligned}
\fint_0^\infty \varphi(x) F(\frac{x}{t}) dx \quad \sim_{t\to 0} \quad & \sum_{j<q} \frac{\varphi^{(j)}(0)}{j!} \fint_0^\infty x^j F(x) dx \; t^{j+1} \\
& + \sum_{\substack{\beta\in \operatorname{spec}_\infty(F) \\ \operatorname{Re}\beta \geq -q-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\beta^\infty} b_{\beta k} \fint_0^\infty \varphi(x) x^\beta \log^k(x/t) dx \; t^{-\beta} \\
& + \sum_{\substack{\beta\in \operatorname{spec}_\infty(F)\cap\mathbf{Z} \\ -q-1\leq \operatorname{Re}\beta \leq -1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\beta^\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}\varphi^{(-\beta-1)}(0)}{(-\beta-1)!} b_{\beta k} \frac{\log^{k+1}(t)}{k+1} \; t^{-\beta} \\
& + \sum_{\substack{\alpha\in \operatorname{spec}_0(F)\cap\mathbf{Z} \\ -q-1\leq \operatorname{Re}\alpha \leq -1}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha^0} \frac{(-1)^{k}\varphi^{(-\alpha-1)}(0)}{(-\alpha-1)!} a_{\alpha k} \frac{\log^{k+1}(t)}{k+1} \; t^{-\alpha} \\
& + O(t^{q+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

A simple consequence of what we have done so far is the following version of the "singular asymptotics lemma"(SAL) of BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS1]. While Proposition 2.1.8 is more adequate for the heat kernel of FUCHS type operators, SAL also applies to the resolvent expansion.

**Theorem 2.1.11 (SAL)** *Let* $C$ *be the sector* $\{\xi \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, |\arg \xi| < \pi - \varepsilon\}$ *and* $\sigma : \mathbf{R} \times C \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ *having the following properties:*

(i) *In the first argument,* $\sigma$ *is* $(p-1)$*–times continuously differentiable and* $\partial_x^{(p-1)}\sigma(\cdot, \zeta)$ *is absolute continuous on* $[0, \infty)$*.*

(ii) *All derivatives up to order* $p$ *of* $\sigma$ *are analytic in the second variable.*

(iii) *There exist functions* $\sigma_{\alpha k} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R})$*, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| x^J \partial_x^K \left[ \sigma(x,\zeta) - \sum_{\operatorname{Re}\alpha > -p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha k}(x) \zeta^\alpha \log^k \zeta \right] \right| \\
& \leq C_{JK} |\zeta|^{-p-1} |\log^r \zeta|, \quad |\zeta| \geq 1, 0 < x \leq |\zeta|, \; K \leq p, \; J \in \mathbf{Z}_+ .
\end{aligned} \tag{1.19}$$

(iv) *There exist functions* $f_p : (0,1] \to \mathbf{R}$*, such that the derivatives* $\sigma^{(j)}(x,\zeta) := \partial_x^j \sigma(x,\zeta)$ *satisfy the integrability condition*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 \int_0^1 s^p |\sigma^{(p)}(\theta st, s\xi)| ds dt & \leq f_p(\theta), \quad p > 0, \\
\int_0^1 |\sigma(\theta s, s\xi)| ds & \leq f_0(\theta), \quad p = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

*for* $0 < \theta \leq 1$*, uniformly for* $|\xi| = 1$*.*

*Then, as* $z \to \infty$ *in* $C$*, one has the asymptotic expansion*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \sigma(x, xz)dx \quad \sim_{z\to\infty} \quad & \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \int\!\!\!\!\!-_0^\infty \frac{\zeta^j}{j!}\sigma^{(j)}(0,\zeta)d\zeta \; z^{-j-1} \\ & + \sum_{\mathrm{Re}\;\alpha > -p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha} \int\!\!\!\!\!-_0^\infty \sigma_{\alpha k}(x)x^\alpha \log^k(xz)dx \; z^\alpha \\ & + \sum_{\alpha=-1}^{-p} \sigma_{\alpha k}^{(-\alpha-1)}(0)\frac{z^\alpha \log^{k+1} z}{(k+1)(-\alpha-1)!} \\ & + O(z^{-p-1}\log^{r+1} z) + O(z^{-p-1} f_p(|z|^{-1})).\end{aligned}$$

**Remarks** 1) If (1.19), (1.20) hold only for $\zeta \geq 0$, then this theorem remains valid for $z \geq 0$. In this case "analyticity in the second variable" can be replaced by "measurability".

2) Of course, as long as we do not have any control on the functions $f_p$, the statement of the theorem is empty. BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS1] require that the left hand side of (1.20) is bounded, i.e. that a constant can be taken as $f_p$. However, in this chapter we will find a situation in which boundedness of $f_p$ cannot be achieved. We state another simple criterion for logarithmic growth of $f_0$.

**Supplement to Theorem 2.1.11** *The two estimates*

$$|\sigma(x,\zeta)| \leq \varphi(x)|\zeta|^{-1}, \quad 0 < |\zeta| \leq 1, \; 0 < x \leq 1,$$

*and*

$$|\sigma(\theta s, s\xi)| \leq c\theta^{-T} s^{\varepsilon - 1}, \quad 0 < \theta \leq 1, \; 0 < s \leq 1$$

*with* $\varphi \in C[0,1], \varepsilon, T > 0$*, uniformly in* $|\xi| = 1$*, imply*

$$\int_0^1 |\sigma(\theta s, s\xi)|ds = O(\log\theta), \quad \theta \to 0.$$

**Proof** Putting $G = T/\varepsilon$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 |\sigma(\theta s, s\xi)|ds &= \int_0^{\theta^G} |\sigma(\theta s, s\xi)|ds + \int_{\theta^G}^1 |\sigma(\theta s, s\xi)|ds \\ &= O(\theta^{-T}\int_0^{\theta^G} s^{\varepsilon-1}ds) + O(\int_{\theta^G}^1 \frac{ds}{s}) \\ &= O(1) + O(\log\theta) = O(\log\theta).\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proof of SAL:** The existence of the integral follows from (1.19), (1.20). We only prove the expansion for $z > 0$. For the general case cf. the remark at the end of [BS1, Sec. 2]. We choose a cut–off function $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ with

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \geq 1, \\ 0, & x \leq 1/2 \end{cases}$$

and write

$$\sigma(x,\zeta) =: \sum_{\mathrm{Re}\;\alpha > -p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha k}(x)\psi(\zeta)\zeta^\alpha \log^k \zeta + \sigma_1(x,\zeta).$$

Then the summands on the right hand side satisfy the integrability condition and

$$|x^J\partial_x^K\sigma_1(x,\zeta)| \le c_{JK}|\zeta|^{-p-1}|\log^r\zeta|, \quad |\zeta|\ge 1, 0<x\le|\zeta|, K\le p.$$

The Taylor expansion of $\sigma_1$ yields for $p\ge 1$

$$\sigma_1(x,\zeta)=\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\frac{\sigma_1^{(j)}(0,\zeta)}{j!}\zeta^j+\frac{x^p}{(p-1)!}\int_0^1(1-t)^{p-1}\sigma_1^{(p)}(tx,\zeta)dt$$

and we find, using (1.19), (1.20),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty\int_0^1(1-t)^{p-1}x^p|\sigma_1^{(p)}(tx,xz)|dtdx\\
&\\
&\quad= O\left(\int_0^{1/z}\int_0^1 x^p|\sigma_1^{(p)}(tx,xz)|dtdx\right)\\
&\qquad\ O\left(\int_{1/z}^\infty\int_0^1 x^p|\sigma_1^{(p)}(tx,xz)|dtdx\right)\\
&\quad= O\left(z^{-p-1}\int_0^1\int_0^1 s^p|\sigma_1^{(p)}(st/z,s)|dsdt\right)\\
&\qquad+O\left(z^{-p-1}\int_{1/z}^\infty x^{-1}|\log^r(xz)|\int_0^1(1+tx)^{-1}dtdx\right)\\
&\quad= O\left(z^{-p-1}f_p(z^{-1})\right)+O\left(z^{-p-1}\int_{1/z}^\infty x^{-2}\log^r(xz)\log(1+x)dx\right)\\
&\quad= O(z^{-p-1}\log^{r+1}z)+O(z^{-p-1}f_p(z^{-1})).
\end{aligned}$$

For $p=0$ the same estimate is shown similarly. It remains to consider functions of the type

$$\sigma(x,\zeta)=\sigma_{\alpha k}(x)\psi(\zeta)\zeta^\alpha\log^k\zeta=:\sigma_{\alpha k}(x)F(\zeta).$$

Putting $t=1/z$, we find, together with Corollary 2.1.10,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty\sigma(x,xz)dx \quad &= \quad \int_0^\infty\sigma_{\alpha k}(x)F(x/t)dx\\
&\sim_{z\to\infty}\ \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\frac{\sigma_{\alpha k}^{(j)}(0)}{j!}\fint_0^\infty x^jF(x)dx\ z^{-j-1}\\
&\qquad+\fint_0^\infty\sigma_{\alpha k}(x)x^\alpha\log^k(xz)dx\ z^\alpha\\
&\qquad+\sum_{l=-1}^{-\infty}\delta_{\alpha,l}\frac{\sigma_{\alpha k}^{(-\alpha-1)}(0)}{(-\alpha-1)!}\frac{\log^{k+1}(z)}{k+1}z^\alpha\\
&\qquad+O(z^{-p-1}\log^{r+1}z)+O(z^{-p-1}f_p(z^{-1})).
\end{aligned}$$

□

## 2.2 The Scaling Property on the Model Cone

In this section we deal exclusively with FUCHS type operators on the model cone $M = N^\wedge$. Here, the scaling operator on the positive half line will play an important role.

**Definition 2.2.1** *We put*

$$U_t : L^2(N^\wedge, E) \longrightarrow L^2(N^\wedge, E), f \mapsto t^{\frac{1}{2}} f(t\cdot). \tag{2.1}$$

*Obviously, $U_t$ is an isometry and we have $U_s U_t = U_{st}$.*

For $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ one immediately checks the formula

$$U_t P_0 U_t^* = t^{-\nu} P_{0,t}, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$P_{0,t} := X^{-\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(tx) D^k,$$

in particular, for $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$, one has

$$U_t P_0 U_t^* = t^{-\nu} P_0.$$

**Definition 2.2.2** *A closed extension, $P$, of $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ is called scalable, if $U_t^* P U_t = t^\nu P$.*

**Remark** In any case, the operators $P_{0,\max}$ and $P_{0,\min}$ are scalable. If $P \geq 0$, then its Friedrichs extension is scalable, too.

Using (2.2) an easy calculation shows the following:

**Lemma 2.2.3** *Let $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ be symmetric and $P$ a self–adjoint extension, $P_t := t^\nu U_t P U_t^*$. Moreover, let $f : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ be a function, such that the operator $f(P)$ has a measurable kernel. Then, for $\lambda > 0$,*

$$f(P)(x,p,y,q) = \frac{1}{\lambda} f(\lambda^{-\nu} P_\lambda)(\frac{x}{\lambda}, p, \frac{y}{\lambda}, q), \;\; \lambda > 0. \tag{2.3}$$

*In particular, for a non–negative elliptic $L_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ and a positive self–adjoint extension $L$ we have*

$$e^{-tL}(x,p,x,q) = \frac{1}{x} e^{-tx^{-\nu} L_x}(1,p,1,q). \tag{2.4}$$

Together with the methods of Section 2.1 this scaling formula ist the main tool for calculating the asymptotic expansion of the heat trace of $L$. In the sequel let $L_0, L$ be as in the preceding lemma. In addition we assume that a compact group, $G$, of isometries acts on $N^\wedge$. Since $N^\wedge$ is equipped with the product metric, this $G$–action is induced by a $G$–action on $N$, i. e.

$$g(x,p) = (x, gp)$$

for $(x,p) \in N^\wedge, g \in G$. Denote by $N_1, \cdots, N_k$ the components of the fixed point set of $g$ in $N$. Then, the fixed point set of $g$ in $M$ is given by

$$M^g = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbf{R}_+ \times N_j.$$

We put $m_j := \dim N_j + 1$ and assume furthermore that $L$ is $G$–invariant. By Theorem 1.1.18 we have an asymptotic expansion

$$\operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-tL})(\xi,\xi)) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{n=0}^\infty \Phi_{j,n}(\xi) t^{\frac{n-m_j}{\mu}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where the $\Phi_{j,n}$ are smooth distributions with support in $\mathbf{R}_+ \times N_j$, i. e. there exist functions $\varphi_{j,n} = \varphi_{j,n}(\cdot, L) \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+ \times N_j)$, such that for $\psi \in C_0^\infty(M)$

$$< \Phi_{j,n}, \psi >= \int_{\mathbf{R}_+ \times N_j} \varphi_{j,n}(\xi)\psi(\xi)d\xi.$$

The asymptotic expansion is uniform on compact subsets of $M$.

(2.4) and (2.5) immediately yield

$$\varphi_{j,n}(x,p,L) = x^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m_j-n)-1} \varphi_{j,n}(1,p,L_x). \tag{2.6}$$

Since $(L_{0,x})_{0\le x<\infty}$ is a smooth family of elliptic operators and since $\varphi_{j,n}(1,p,L_x)$ is a smooth function in the complete symbol and all its derivatives, the map $[0,\infty) \ni x \mapsto \varphi_{j,n}(1,p,L_x)$ is smooth. In particular, we find that in general $\varphi_{j,n}$ is integrable on $[0,\delta]$ only if $n < m_j$. This is one of the reasons that the asymptotic expansion of the heat trace cannot be obtained simply by integrating the local asymptotics.

For $L_0 \in \operatorname{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ and a scalable positive extension, $L$, we put

$$k_g(t) := \int_N \operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-tL})(1,p,1,p))dp. \tag{2.7}$$

**Lemma 2.2.4** *There exists a $\delta > 0$,*

$$k_g(t) = O(t^{-\delta}), t \to \infty. \tag{2.8}$$

*Moreover,*

$$k_g(t) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{n=0}^\infty \int_{N_j} \varphi_{j,n}(1,p)dp \ t^{\frac{n-m_j}{\mu}}. \tag{2.9}$$

We put

$$b_{j,n} := \int_{N_j} \varphi_{j,n}(1,p)dp,$$

resp., for $n \geq 0$,

$$b_n := \sum_{j=1}^k b_{n-m+m_j,j}.$$

With this notation we have the more convenient expansion

$$k_g(t) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n t^{\frac{n-m}{\mu}}. \tag{2.10}$$

**Proof** The asymptotics as $t \to 0$ is just (2.5). It remains to prove the estimate (2.8). Corollary 1.3.14 and Proposition 1.4.5 yield

$$|e^{-L}(x,p,y,q)| \le c(xy)^{\varepsilon-1/2}$$

for $x, y \le x_0, p, q \in N$. Then, by the scaling formula (2.3),

$$|e^{-tL}(x,p,y,q)| \le c(xy)^{\varepsilon-1/2} t^{-\frac{2\varepsilon}{\nu}}$$

for $x, y \le x_0, p, q \in N, t \ge t_0$, thus

$$k_g(t) = O(t^{-\frac{2\varepsilon}{\nu}}), t \to \infty. \qquad \square$$

**Definition 2.2.5** *We put for* Re $s < \delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\zeta}_g(L,s) &:= \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^{\infty} t^{s-1} k_g(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} (M k_g)(s). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition and Definition 2.1.2 and the considerations we have done so far yield

**Proposition 2.2.6** *Let $L_0 \in \operatorname{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ be elliptic, non–negative and $G$–invariant. Let $L$ be a self–adjoint extension, which is also non–negative, scalable and $G$–invariant. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$, such that for $g \in G$ the function $\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s)$ is meromorphic for* Re $s < \delta$ *with possibly simple poles in $\frac{m-n}{\mu}$. The residue is given by*

$$\Gamma(\tfrac{m-n}{\mu})^{-1} b_n, \quad \tfrac{m-n}{\mu} \notin \mathbf{Z}.$$

*In $s = -k, k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$, $\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s)$ is regular and its value is*

$$(\operatorname{Res}\Gamma(-k))^{-1} b_{m+k\mu}.$$

**Definition 2.2.7** *Let $P_0 \in \operatorname{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ be elliptic and $G$–invariant. For $g \in G$ put*

$$\begin{aligned} k_g^+(t) &:= k_g((P_{0,\min})^* P_{0,\min}, t) \\ k_g^-(t) &:= k_g(P_{0,\min}(P_{0,\min})^*, t). \end{aligned}$$

*Then we define*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_g(P_0,s) &:= \Gamma(s)(\hat{\zeta}_g((P_{0,\min})^* P_{0,\min}, s) - \hat{\zeta}_g(P_{0,\min}(P_{0,\min})^*, s)) \\ &= (M(k_g^+ - k_g^-))(s). \end{aligned}$$

A direct consequence of Proposition 2.2.6 is

**Corollary 2.2.8** *There exists a $\delta > 0$, such that $\hat{\eta}_g(P_0, s)$ is meromorphic in* $\operatorname{Re} s < \delta$. *A priori $\hat{\eta}_g(P_0, s)$ has a simple pole at 0 with*

$$\operatorname{Res}_1 \hat{\eta}_g(P_0, 0) = b_m^+ - b_m^-.$$

**Remark** Lateron we will see that $\hat{\eta}_g(P_0, s)$ is regular at 0, at least if $\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P_0)$ is the boundary symbol of a $G$–invariant elliptic operator on a compact manifold with conic singularities.

Since an operator $P \in \operatorname{Diff}_c^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ is determined by its MELLIN symbol $\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P)$, in the sequel we will sometimes write $\hat{\eta}_g(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(P), s)$ instead of $\hat{\eta}_g(P, s)$.

## 2.3 Operators of Order 1 and 2

In this section we discuss in detail a class of Sturm–Liouville operators on the half axis $\mathbf{R}_+$, for which it is possible to compute the invariants $\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\eta}$ rather explicitly. In particular, we will recover results of Callias [Ca2].

We are going to proceed in two steps. First we are going to discuss a class of one–dimensional Sturm–Liouville operators. In the second Subsection we will replace the potential by an operator.

### 2.3.1 The one–dimensional Case

For $p > -1$ let

$$l_p := -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{p^2 - \frac{1}{4}}{x^2} \tag{3.1}$$

with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Obviously, with

$$D_p := -\frac{d}{dx} + \frac{p + \frac{1}{2}}{x} \tag{3.2}$$

we have the identity

$$l_p = D_p^t D_p.$$

The discussion in (1.11) and Proposition 1.3.11 imply immediately

**Lemma 2.3.1** *For $p \geq 1$, the operator $l_p$ is essentially self–adjoint. For $-1 < p < 1$, 0 is in the limit circle case and $\infty$ is in the limit point case. Furthermore, $D_{p,\min} = D_{p,\max}$ for $p \geq 0$ and for $-1 < p < 0$ the map*

$$c_p : \mathcal{D}(D_{p,\max}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}, \;\; f \mapsto \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-p-\frac{1}{2}} f(x)$$

*is well–defined, continuous and induces an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{D}(D_{p,\max})/\mathcal{D}(D_{p,\min}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}.$$

**Definition 2.3.2** *For $p \geq 0$ let*

$$L_p := (D_{p,\min})^* D_{p,\min} = l_p^{\mathcal{F}}$$

*be the Friedrichs extension of $l_p$ and for $-1 < p < 0$ let*

$$L_p := (D_{p,\max})^* D_{p,\max}$$

*be the "Neumann" extension of $l_p$.*

A decisive tool for understanding the operators $L_p$ is the HANKEL *transform*, which we are going to recall now.

**Definition 2.3.3** *For* $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$ *and* $p > -1$ *the* HANKEL *transform of order* $p$ *is defined to be*

$$(\mathcal{H}_p f)(x) := \int_0^\infty (xy)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_p(xy) f(y) dy.$$

*Here,* $J_p$ *is the* BESSEL *function of order* $p$.

**Proposition 2.3.4** $\mathcal{H}_p$ *extends to a self–adjoint isometry* $L^2(\mathbf{R}_+) \to L^2(\mathbf{R}_+)$.

Though this proposition is well–known [Co, Chap. III], our considerations will give another proof of this fact. Our next goal is to prove the following

**Proposition 2.3.5** $\mathcal{H}_p$ *diagonalizes the operator* $L_p$. *More precisely,*

$$\mathcal{D}(L_p) = \{f \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+) \,|\, X^2 \mathcal{H}_p f \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+)\}$$

*and*

$$\mathcal{H}_p L_p \mathcal{H}_p f = X^2 f.$$

The technique, we are going to use, is a calculus that reminds the reader of the "annihilator–creator" calculus of the harmonic oscillator.

Now we are going to introduce operators which have discrete spectrum and which have the same behavior as $x \to 0$ as $D_p$ resp. $l_p$. Let

$$A_p := D_p - X \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$h_p := A_p^t A_p = l_p - 2(p+1) + X^2. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover we have

$$A_p A_p^t = h_{p+1} + 4.$$

Analogous to Definition 2.3.2 let, for $p \geq 0$,

$$H_p := (A_{p,\min})^* A_{p,\min} = h_p^{\mathcal{F}}$$

be the Friedrichs extension of $h_p$ and, for $-1 < p < 0$, let

$$H_p := (A_{p,\max})^* A_{p,\max}$$

be the "Neumann" extension of $h_p$.

Obviously, Lemma 2.3.1 holds accordingly for $H_p$ resp. $A_p$. Moreover, we abbreviate

$$g_p(x) := x^{\frac{1}{2}} J_p(x).$$

The following recursion relations hold true [Wa, 3.2], [R, Sec. 60]

$$\begin{aligned} J_{p+1}(x) &= -J_p'(x) + \frac{p}{x} J_p(x), \\ J_{p-1}(x) &= \phantom{-}J_p'(x) + \frac{p}{x} J_p(x), \end{aligned}$$

resp.

$$\begin{aligned} g_{p+1} &= D_p g_p, \\ g_{p-1} &= D^t_{p-1} g_p. \end{aligned}$$

These yield immediately

**Proposition 2.3.6** *On* $C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$ *the following relations hold true:*

$$\begin{array}{rclrcl} \mathcal{H}_p D_p^t &=& X\mathcal{H}_{p+1}, & \mathcal{H}_{p+1} D_p &=& X\mathcal{H}_p, \\ \mathcal{H}_p X &=& D_p^t \mathcal{H}_{p+1}, & \mathcal{H}_{p+1} X &=& D_p \mathcal{H}_p, \\ \mathcal{H}_p A_p^t &=& -A_p^t \mathcal{H}_{p+1}, & \mathcal{H}_{p+1} A_p &=& -A_p \mathcal{H}_p. \end{array}$$

*In particular,* $H_p$ *and* $\mathcal{H}_p$ *commute.*

Next let $L_n^{(p)}(x)$ be the Laguerre polynomials. Then $(x^{\frac{p}{2}} e^{-\frac{x}{2}} L_n^{(p)}(x))_{n\geq 0}$ is a complete orthogonal system in $L^2(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Via the unitary transformation

$$L^2(\mathbf{R}_+) \longrightarrow L^2(\mathbf{R}_+), \ \ f \mapsto (x \mapsto (2x)^{\frac{1}{2}} f(x^2))$$

we obtain the complete orthogonal system

$$l_n^{(p)}(x) := x^{p+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} L_n^{(p)}(x^2).$$

**Proposition 2.3.7** $l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(H_p)$ *and*

$$H_p l_n^{(p)} = 4n\, l_n^{(p)}.$$

*In particular,* $H_p$ *is discrete with* spec $H_p = 4\mathbf{Z}_+$.

**Proof** A direct computation, using the differential equation of the Laguerre polynomials and the formula $(L_n^{(p)})' = -L_{n-1}^{(p+1)}$ [R, p. 203], yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_p l_n^{(p)} &= -2 l_{n-1}^{(p+1)} \\ A_p^t l_n^{(p+1)} &= -2(n+1) l_{n+1}^{(p)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(A_{p,\max})$ and $A_{p,\max} l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(A^t_{p,\max})$. For $p \geq 0$ we have $l_n^{(p)}(x) = O(x^{\frac{1}{2}}), x \to 0$, and thus $l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(A_{p,\min})$. But this means that $l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(H_p)$ and $H_p l_n^{(p)} = 4n l_n^{(p)}$.

For $-1 < p < 0$ we have $A_p l_n^{(p)}(x) = -2 l_n^{(p+1)} = O(x^{\frac{1}{2}}), x \to 0$. Consequently $A_p l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(A^t_{p,\min})$ and hence $l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(H_p)$. □

Now, Proposition 2.3.4 is a consequence of

**Lemma 2.3.8** $\mathcal{H}_p l_n^{(p)} = (-1)^n l_n^{(p)}$.

**Proof** We proceed by induction. A direct calculation gives

$$\mathcal{H}_p l_0^{(p)} = \int_0^\infty g_p(xy) y^{p+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}} dy = l_0^{(p)}.$$

Now we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_p l_{n+1}^{(p)} &= \tfrac{-1}{2(n+1)} \mathcal{H}_p A_p^t l_n^{(p+1)} \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2(n+1)} A_p^t \mathcal{H}_{p+1} l_n^{(p+1)} \\ &= (-1)^{n+1} \tfrac{-1}{2(n+1)} A_p^t l_n^{(p+1)} \\ &= (-1)^{n+1} l_{n+1}^{(p)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can prove Proposition 2.3.5:

The proof of Proposition 2.3.7 shows $l_n^{(p)} \in \mathcal{D}(L_p)$. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that Proposition 2.3.6 is still true for $l_n^{(p)}$. Thus

$$\mathcal{H}_p L_p \mathcal{H}_p l_n^{(p)} = X^2 l_n^{(p)}.$$

Since the operator of multiplication by $X^2$ is essentially self–adjoint on the space span $< l_n^{(p)}; n \in \mathbf{Z}_+ >$, the assertion follows. □

Proposition 2.3.5 allows us to express the heat kernel of $L_p$ explicitly in terms of BESSEL functions.

**Proposition 2.3.9** *We have for* $t > 0$

$$e^{-tL_p}(x,y) = \tfrac{1}{2t}(xy)^{\frac{1}{2}} I_p(\tfrac{xy}{2t}) e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{4t}}.$$

*Here,* $I_p$ *denotes the modified* BESSEL *function of order* $p$.

**Proof** Choose $f \in C_0^\infty(0,\infty)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} (e^{-tL_p} f)(x) &= (\mathcal{H}_p e^{-tX^2} \mathcal{H}_p f)(x) \\ &= \int_0^\infty g_p(x\xi) e^{-t\xi^2} (\mathcal{H}_p f)(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left( \int_0^\infty (xy)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_p(x\xi) J_p(y\xi) \xi e^{-t\xi^2} d\xi \right) f(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

The inner integral is known. It is the so–called Weber's 2. exponential integral [Wa, 13.31]. We find

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-tL_p}(x,y) &= (xy)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\infty J_p(x\xi) J_p(y\xi) \xi e^{-t\xi^2} d\xi \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2t}(xy)^{\frac{1}{2}} I_p(\tfrac{xy}{2t}) e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{4t}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In Lemma 2.2.4 we associated a function, $k(t)$, to any positive elliptic FUCHS type operator. For $L_p$, this function is

$$k(t) = e^{-tL_p}(1,1) = \tfrac{1}{2t} I_p(\tfrac{1}{2t}) e^{-1/2t}.$$

Of course, the asymptotic behavior as $t \to 0$ can be deduced directly from the well–known asymptotic relations of $I_p(x)$ as $x \to \infty$ [Wa, 7.23]. By the change of variables rule Lemma 2.1.4, the $\zeta$–function is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\zeta}(L_p, s) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} \tfrac{1}{2t} I_p(\tfrac{1}{2t}) e^{-1/2t} dt \\ &= \frac{2^{-s}}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty x^{-s} I_p(x) e^{-x} dx, \end{aligned}$$

for complex $s$ except the countably many points in which, according to Lemma 2.1.4, correction terms occur. By the asymptotic relations of the BESSEL functions

$$I_p(x) \sim c x^p,\ x \to 0; \quad I_p(x) \sim c x^{-1/2} e^x,\ x \to \infty,$$

the integral exists for $\frac{1}{2} < s < p+1$ in the Lebesgue sense. If $p \le -\frac{1}{2}$, we can write

$$I_p(x) = \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^p + R_p(x)$$

with $R_p(x) \sim c x^{p+2}$, $x \to 0$; $R_p(x) \sim I_p(x)$, $x \to \infty$ and find

$$\int_0^\infty x^{-s} I_p(x) e^{-x} dx = \int_0^\infty x^{-s} \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^p e^{-x} dx + \int_0^\infty x^{-s} R_p(x) e^{-x} dx,$$

where the second integral converges in the Lebesgue sense for $\frac{1}{2} < s < p+3$. We have [Wa, 3.7]

$$I_p(x) = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{1}{m!\Gamma(m+p+1)} \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^{2m+p}.$$

For real $s$, all summands are non–negative, hence the monotone convergence theorem applies and we have, for $\frac{1}{2} < s < p+3$,

$$\int_0^\infty x^{-s} I_p(x) e^{-x} dx = \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\Gamma(-s+2m+p+1)}{2^{2m+p} m! \Gamma(m+p+1)}.$$

Using LEGENDRE's duplication formula $\Gamma(2z) = \frac{2^{2z-1}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Gamma(z)\Gamma(z+\frac{1}{2})$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots &= \frac{2^{-s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\Gamma(\frac{-s+p+1}{2}+m)\Gamma(\frac{-s+p+2}{2}+m)}{m!\Gamma(m+p+1)} \\ &= \frac{2^{-s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{-s+p+1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{-s+p+2}{2})}{\Gamma(p+1)} \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\left(\frac{-s+p+1}{2}\right)_m \left(\frac{-s+p+2}{2}\right)_m}{m!(p+1)_m} \\ &= 2^{-p} \frac{\Gamma(-s+p+1)}{\Gamma(p+1)} F(\tfrac{-s+p+1}{2}, \tfrac{-s+p+2}{2}, p+1; 1), \end{aligned}$$

where $F(a,b,c;z)$ is the hypergeometric function. Now

$$F(a,b,c;1) = \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c-a-b)}{\Gamma(c-a)\Gamma(c-b)}$$

[R, Sec. 32] and invoking again the duplication formula we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots &= 2^{-p}\frac{\Gamma(-s+p+1)}{\Gamma(p+1)}\frac{\Gamma(p+1)\Gamma(s-\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{p+s+1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{p+s}{2})} \\ &= \frac{2^{s-1}}{\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{\Gamma(-s+p+1)\Gamma(s-\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(p+s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up we have proved

**Proposition 2.3.10**

$$\hat{\zeta}(L_p, s) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{\Gamma(-s+p+1)\Gamma(s-\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(p+s)\Gamma(s)}.$$

### 2.3.2 The General Case

We turn back to the model cone, $N^\wedge$, over a compact $G$–manifold $N$. Let $A \in \mathrm{Diff}^2(N,E)$ be a non–negative elliptic $G$–invariant differential operator. We consider

$$l := -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{A-\frac{1}{4}}{x^2}. \tag{3.5}$$

By $V_\lambda$ we denote the eigenspace of $A$ to the eigenvalue $\lambda$ and by

$$\Phi_\lambda : L^2(N,E) \longrightarrow V_\lambda$$

the orthogonal projection. $\Phi_\lambda$ has a $C^\infty$ kernel which we also denote by $\Phi_\lambda(u,v)$. In order to obtain a $G$–invariant self–adjoint extension of $l$, we choose a function

$$p : \mathrm{spec}\ A \longrightarrow (-1,\infty)$$

with

$$p(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda}, & \lambda \geq 1, \\ \pm\sqrt{\lambda}, & -1 < \lambda < 1, \end{cases}$$

and put

$$L := \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathrm{spec}\ A} L_{p(\lambda)} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{V_\lambda}$$

with respect to the orthogonal decomposition

$$L^2(N^\wedge, E) = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathrm{spec}\ A} L^2(\mathbf{R}_+) \otimes V_\lambda.$$

Obviously, $L$ is self–adjoint, non–negative, and $G$–invariant.

**Proposition 2.3.11** *The heat kernel of $L$ is given by*

$$e^{-tL}(x,u,y,v) = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathrm{spec}\ A} \tfrac{1}{2t}(xy)^{\frac{1}{2}} I_{p(\lambda)}(\tfrac{xy}{2t}) e^{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{4t}} \Phi_\lambda(u,v). \tag{3.6}$$

*For $g \in G$ the function $k_g(t)$ is given by*

$$k_g(t) = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec } A} e^{-tL_{p(\lambda)}}(1,1)\operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*), \tag{3.7}$$

*where $g_\lambda^*$ denotes the endomorphism of $V_\lambda$ induced by $g$. Moreover,*

$$\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(s-\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(s)} \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec } A} \frac{\Gamma(-s+p(\lambda)+1)}{\Gamma(s+p(\lambda))}\operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*). \tag{3.8}$$

**Proof** Most of the work is already done. From

$$I_p(x) = i^{-p}J_p(ix) = \frac{\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^p}{\Gamma(p+\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})}\int_{-1}^{1} e^{-xt}(1-t^2)^{p-\frac{1}{2}}dt$$

[Wa, 3.3] we infer

$$|I_p(x)| \le c\,\Gamma(p+\frac{1}{2})^{-1}\,x^p.$$

Furthermore, by the elliptic estimate Lemma 1.1.17,

$$|\Phi_\lambda(u,v)| \le C(1+\lambda^s)m(\lambda),$$

where $s > n/4$ is arbitrary and $m(\lambda)$ denotes the multiplicity of $\lambda$. Now it is easy to see that (3.6) converges uniformly on compact subsets of $N^\wedge \times N^\wedge$, and hence it is the heat kernel.

(3.7) is an immediate consequence of (3.6). Corollary 2.A.2 shows that for $p(\lambda) \ge p_0$ large enough and $\frac{1}{2} \le s \ll p_0$ the dominated convergence theorem applies to

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \text{spec } A \\ p(\lambda) \ge p_0}} t^{s-1}e^{-tL_{p(\lambda)}}(1,1)\operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*).$$

Since only a finite number of $p(\lambda)$ are smaller than $< p_0$, we are done by Proposition 2.3.10. □

Next we want to study more closely the behavior of $\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s)$ at $s=0$. For that we need the Appendix A. Using Corollary 2.A.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec } A} \tfrac{\Gamma(-s+p(\lambda)+1)}{\Gamma(s+p(\lambda))}\operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*) &= \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec } A \cap (0,1)} \operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*)\left\{\tfrac{\Gamma(-s+p(\lambda)+1)}{\Gamma(s+p(\lambda))} - \tfrac{\Gamma(-s+|p(\lambda)|+1)}{\Gamma(s+|p(\lambda)|)}\right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec } A\setminus\{0\}} \operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*)\tfrac{\Gamma(-s+|p(\lambda)|+1)}{\Gamma(s+|p(\lambda)|)} - s\,\tfrac{\Gamma(-s)}{\Gamma(s)}\operatorname{tr}(g_0^*) \\ &=: I(s) + \sum_{j=0}^{N} Q_j(s)\zeta_g(A, \tfrac{j-1}{2}+s) + R(s)\end{aligned}$$

with a function, $R(s)$, analytic near 0, and $R(0)=0$. Here

$$\zeta_g(A,z) = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec } A\setminus\{0\}} \operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*)\lambda^{-z}$$

is the $G$–equivariant $\zeta$–function of $A$ [G, Sec. 4.5]. Obviously, $I(s)$ is regular at 0 with

$$\begin{aligned} I(0) &= \sum_{\lambda\in \text{spec } A\cap(0,1)} \operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*)(p(\lambda)-|p(\lambda)|) \\ &= \sum_{p(\lambda)<0} 2p(\lambda)\operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\zeta_g(A)$ has only simple poles, we obtain furthermore

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} Q_j(s)\zeta_g(A,\tfrac{j-1}{2}+s) = \zeta_g(A,s-\frac{1}{2}) - \sum_{j=1}^{N/2}(-1)^j s b_j j^{-1}\zeta_g(A,j+s-\frac{1}{2}) + O(s).$$

For $\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s)$, these considerations yield

**Proposition 2.3.12**

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Res}_1(\Gamma(s)\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s))_{s=0} &= -\operatorname{Res}_1\zeta_g(A)(-\frac{1}{2}) \\ \operatorname{Res}_0(\Gamma(s)\hat{\zeta}_g(L,s))_{s=0} &= \frac{\Gamma'(-\frac{1}{2})}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\operatorname{Res}_1\zeta_g(A)(-\frac{1}{2}) - \operatorname{Res}_0\zeta_g(A)(-\frac{1}{2}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N/2}(-1)^j b_j j^{-1}\operatorname{Res}_1\zeta_g(A)(j-\frac{1}{2}) - \sum_{p(\lambda)<0} 2p(\lambda)\operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*). \end{aligned}$$

Next we consider a 1st order operator: Let $S\in \operatorname{Diff}^1(N,E)$ be a $G$–invariant self–adjoint elliptic differential operator. We consider

$$D := \frac{d}{dx} + \frac{1}{x}S. \tag{3.9a}$$

Again, we denote by $V_\lambda$ the eigenspace of $S$ to the eigenvalue $\lambda$ and by $\Phi_\lambda : L^2(E)\longrightarrow V_\lambda$ the orthogonal projection. Obviously, if one puts $A^\pm := S^2 \pm S + 1/4 = (S\pm 1/2)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} D^tD &= -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{S^2+S}{x^2} = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{A^+-1/4}{x^2}, \\ DD^t &= -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{S^2-S}{x^2} = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{A^--1/4}{x^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9b}$$

are of the type (3.5). Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\min}^*D_{\min} &= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\text{spec } S} L_{p^+(\lambda)}\otimes \operatorname{Id}_{V_\lambda}, \\ D_{\min}D_{\min}^* &= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\text{spec } S} L_{p^-(\lambda)}\otimes \operatorname{Id}_{V_\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p^+(\lambda) &= |\lambda+1/2|, \\ p^-(\lambda) &= \begin{cases} |\lambda-1/2|, & |\lambda|\geq 1/2, \\ \lambda-1/2, & |\lambda|<1/2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For the computation of the residues of $\hat{\eta}_g(D_{\min}, s)$, we consider, for $\varepsilon > 0$, the function

$$h^\varepsilon(s) := \zeta_g((S+\varepsilon)^2, s) - \zeta_g((S-\varepsilon)^2, s). \tag{3.10}$$

By the preceding considerations we have

$$\operatorname{Res}_1(\hat{\eta}_g(D_{\min}))(0) = -\operatorname{Res}_1 h^{1/2}(-\frac{1}{2})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Res}_0(\hat{\eta}_g(D_{\min}))(0) &= \frac{\Gamma'(-\frac{1}{2})}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\operatorname{Res}_1 h^{1/2}(-\frac{1}{2}) - \operatorname{Res}_0 h^{1/2}(-\frac{1}{2}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N/2}(-1)^j b_j j^{-1}\operatorname{Res}_1 h^{1/2}(j-\frac{1}{2}) + \sum_{p^-(\lambda)<0} 2p^-(\lambda)\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity we will omit the summation index "$\lambda \in \operatorname{spec} S$" in the sequel. We just put $\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda) = 0$ if $\lambda \notin \operatorname{spec} S$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_g((S\pm\varepsilon)^2, s) &= \sum_{|\lambda|\le\varepsilon,\lambda\neq\mp\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)|\lambda\pm\varepsilon|^{-2s} + \sum_{|\lambda|>\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)|\lambda\pm\varepsilon|^{-2s} \\ &=: I(s) + II(s)\end{aligned}$$

and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}II(s) &= \sum_{|\lambda|>\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)|\lambda|^{-2s}(1\pm\varepsilon/\lambda)^{-2s} \\ &= \sum_{l\ge 0}\binom{-2s}{2l}\varepsilon^{2l}\sum_{|\lambda|>\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)|\lambda|^{-2s-2l} \pm \ldots \\ &\quad \pm\sum_{l\ge 0}\binom{-2s}{2l+1}\varepsilon^{2l+1}\sum_{|\lambda|>\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)\operatorname{sgn}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-2s-2l-1}, \\ &=: \sum_{l\ge 0}\binom{-2s}{2l}\varepsilon^{2l}\zeta_{g,>\varepsilon}(S^2, s+l) \pm \sum_{l\ge 0}\binom{-2s}{2l+1}\varepsilon^{2l+1}\eta_{g,>\varepsilon}(S, 2s+2l+1).\end{aligned}$$

The sum

$$\sum_{l\ge 0}\binom{-2s}{2l+1}\varepsilon^{2l+1}\operatorname{sgn}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-2s-2l-1}$$

certainly does not converge if $|\lambda| < \varepsilon$, hence one cannot express $II(s)$ directly in terms of $\zeta_g(S^2)$ and $\eta_g(S)$. Nevertheless, $\eta_{g,>\varepsilon}$ has the same residues as $\eta_g(S)$. We find

$$\begin{aligned}h^\varepsilon(s) &= 2\sum_{l\ge 0}\binom{-2s}{2l+1}\varepsilon^{2l+1}\eta_{g,>\varepsilon}(S, 2s+2l+1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\lambda|<\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)(|\lambda+\varepsilon|^{-2s} - |\lambda-\varepsilon|^{-2s}) + (2\varepsilon)^{-2s}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\varepsilon) - (2\varepsilon)^{-2s}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_{-\varepsilon}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Res}_1 h^\varepsilon(j-\frac{1}{2}) &= 2\sum_{l\geq 0}\varepsilon^{2l+1}\operatorname{Res}_1(\binom{-2s}{2l+1}\eta_{g,>\varepsilon}(S,2s+2l+1))_{s=j-1/2}\\ &= -\sum_{l\geq 0}\varepsilon^{2l+1}\binom{2j+2l-1}{2l+1}\operatorname{Res}_1\eta_g(S)(2j+2l)\end{aligned}$$

in particular, for $j=0$,

$$\operatorname{Res}_1 h^\varepsilon(-\frac{1}{2}) = \varepsilon\operatorname{Res}_1\eta_g(S)(0). \tag{3.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Res}_0 h^\varepsilon(-\frac{1}{2}) = 2\sum_{|\lambda|<\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)\lambda + 2\varepsilon\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\varepsilon) - 2\varepsilon\operatorname{tr}(g^*_{-\varepsilon}) - 2\varepsilon\sum_{0<|\lambda|\leq\varepsilon}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)\operatorname{sgn}(\lambda)\\ +2\varepsilon\operatorname{Res}_0\eta_g(S)(0) - 2\varepsilon\operatorname{Res}_1\eta_g(S)(0) + 2\sum_{l\geq 1}\frac{\varepsilon^{2l+1}}{(2l+1)2l}\operatorname{Res}_1\eta_g(S)(2l).\end{aligned}$$

We sum up

**Proposition 2.3.13**

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Res}_1(\hat{\eta}_g(D_{\min}))(0) &= -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Res}_1\eta_g(S)(0)\\ \operatorname{Res}_0(\hat{\eta}_g(D_{\min}))(0) &= -\operatorname{Res}_0\eta_g(S)(0) - \operatorname{tr}g^*_0 - 2\sum_{-\frac{1}{2}<\lambda<0}\operatorname{tr}(g^*_\lambda)\\ &\quad +\sum_{k\geq 0}\alpha_k\operatorname{Res}_1\eta_g(S)(2k)\end{aligned}$$

*with universal constants $\alpha_k$, which are independent of $S$ and $g$.*

**Remark** Note that the last sum is in fact finite.

## 2.4 The Main Theorems

Unless otherwise stated, for this section let $M$ be a compact Riemannian $G$–manifold, $\dim M = m$, with conic singularities. Here, $G$ denotes a compact LIE group of isometries on $M$. We use the denotations of Section 2.2.

**Theorem 2.4.1** *Let $L_0 \in \operatorname{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}(M,E)$ be a positive elliptic $G$–invariant differential operator. Assume $L$ to be a positive self–adjoint extension. Denote by $M^g_j$, $\dim M^g_j =: m_j$, the components of the fixed point set of $g\in G$. Then, for $n<m_j$, the $\varphi_{j,n}$ are integrable over $M^g_j$ and we have the asymptotic expansion*

$$\operatorname{Tr}(g^*e^{-tL}) \sim_{t\to 0}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{m_j-1}\int_{M^g_j}\varphi_{j,n}(\xi)d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-m_j}{\mu}} + O(\log t). \tag{4.1}$$

For the proof we will need a simple

**Lemma 2.4.2** *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $L_0 \in \operatorname{Diff}^\mu(M,E)$ be a positive elliptic operator. Assume $L$ to be a positive self–adjoint extension. Then, for any compact subset $K \subset M \times M$ and $t_0 > 0$, there exists a $C$, such that*

$$|e^{-tL}(x,y)| \leq C\,, \quad \text{for}\, x,y \in K,\, t \geq t_0.$$

*If $(L_{\xi,0})_{\xi \in X}$ is a $C^\infty$–family of such operators over a compact parameter manifold $X$, the $C$ can be chosen independently of $\xi$.*

**Proof** Let $k\mu > m/2$. By Lemma 1.1.17 we have for $x \in K$, $s \in \mathcal{D}(L_\xi^k)$

$$|s(x)| \leq c(\|s\| + \|L_\xi^k s\|)$$

with some constant $c > 0$ independent of $\xi$. Now Lemma 1.4.5 yields, for $x,y \in K$,

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{-tL_\xi}(x,y)| &\leq c'(\sup_{u\geq 0} e^{-tu} + \sup_{u \geq 0} u^k e^{-tu})^2 \\ &\leq C \text{ for } t \geq t_0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proof of Theorem 2.4.1** By Theorem 1.4.11 it suffices to prove the corresponding asymptotics on the model cone near the cone tip. Thus let $M = N^\wedge$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ be a cut–off function, $\varphi \equiv 1$ near 0. Using Lemma 2.2.3 we find

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}(g^*\varphi e^{-tL}) &= \int_0^\infty \varphi(x) \int_N \operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-tL})(x,p,x,p))dpdx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \varphi(x) \frac{1}{x} \int_N \operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-tx^{-\nu}L_x})(1,p,1,p))dpdx \qquad (4.2) \\ &=: z\int_0^\infty \varphi(x)\sigma(x,xz)dx \end{aligned}$$

with $z := t^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x,\zeta) &:= \frac{1}{\zeta}\int_N \operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-\zeta^{-\nu}L_x})(1,p,1,p))dp \qquad (4.3) \\ &= \frac{x}{\zeta}\int_N \operatorname{tr}((g^* e^{-x^\nu \zeta^{-\nu} L})(x,p,x,p))dp. \qquad (4.4) \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.6) we have

$$\sigma(x,\zeta) \sim_{\zeta\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{n=0}^{m_j-1} \int_{N_j} \varphi_{j,n}(1,p,L_x)dp\, \zeta^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m_j-n)-1} + O(\zeta^{-1})$$

uniformly in $0 \leq x \leq x_0$. Since $\varphi$ has compact support, the corresponding asymptotics for $\varphi(x)\sigma(x,\zeta)$ holds true uniformly for all $x$. To apply SAL Theorem 2.1.11 we have to verify the assumptions in the supplement to SAL. By Corollary 1.3.14 and Lemma 1.4.5 we have, for $x, y \leq 1, t \leq t_0$,

$$|e^{-tL}(x,p,y,q)| \leq Ct^{-l}(xy)^{\varepsilon-\frac{1}{2}},$$

thus for $0 < \theta \leq 1, 0 < s \leq 1$

$$|\sigma(\theta s,s)| \leq C\theta^{-\nu l + 2\varepsilon} s^{2\varepsilon - 1},$$

where we have used the representation (4.4). From the preceding lemma we infer, using (4.3), for $0 < \zeta < 1, 0 \le x \le 1$

$$|\sigma(x,\zeta)| \le C\frac{1}{\zeta}.$$

Thus SAL Theorem 2.1.11 and the supplement to SAL yield

$$\operatorname{Tr}(g^* e^{-tL}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{n=0}^{m_j-1} \fint_0^\infty \int_{N_j} \varphi_{j,n}(1,p,L_x) x^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m_j-n)-1} dpdx\, t^{\frac{n-m_j}{\mu}} + O(\log t).$$

We had already noted after (2.6) that $\varphi_{j,n}$ is integrable for $n < m_j$. Now the assertion follows from (2.6), too. □

By virtue of the usual Tauberian theorem (cf. [T, Th. XII.2.1, Sec. XII.7]), we state an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4.1:

**Corollary 2.4.3** *Let $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}(M,E)$ be symmetric elliptic and let $P$ a self–adjoint extension. Then $P$ is discrete and the sequence of eigenvalues, $\lambda_j$, satisfies*

$$|\lambda_j| \sim C j^{\frac{\mu}{m}}.$$

**Remark** The reader might ask whether actually every $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}(M,E)$ has self–adjoint extensions. In our situation, this is indeed true because

$$F_t := P_{\max} + ti, \quad -1 \le t \le 1$$

is a FREDHOLM deformation that proves the deficiency indices of $P_0$ to be equal. This argument will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV below.

**Application** Let $V \subset \mathbf{CP}^N$ be an algebraic curve (cf. Section 1.1 example 1). Then every positive self–adjoint extension $\Delta$ of the Laplacian $\Delta_0$ is discrete and we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}(e^{-t\Delta}) \sim_{t\to 0} \frac{\mathrm{vol}(V)}{4\pi} t^{-1} + O(\log t),$$

in particular

$$\lambda_n(\Delta) \sim_{n\to\infty} \frac{4\pi}{\mathrm{vol(V)}} n. \tag{4.5}$$

For the Friedrichs extension, this has been proved independently by Yoshikawa [Yo].

It is still an open problem whether it is possible to achieve a full asymptotic expansion in (4.1). In order to do that one had to verify the "higher" integrability conditions in SAL. For simplicity we state the problem without group actions.

**Problem 2.4.4** *For which elliptic $L_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}(M,E)$ and which self–adjoint extension $L$ is it possible to apply* SAL*?*

In case of the applicability one would obtain the asymptotic expansion

$$\operatorname{Tr}(e^{-tL}) \quad \sim_{t\to 0} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \fint_M a_n(\xi, L) d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-m}{\mu}} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n\, t^{\frac{n-m}{\mu}} \log t + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \beta_n\, t^{\frac{n}{\nu}}, \tag{4.6}$$

where the $a_n(\xi, L)$ are the local invariants of the heat kernel. With

$$b_n(x, L) = \int_N a_n(x, p, L)dp$$

one has (cf. (2.6))

$$b_n(x) = x^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m-n)-1} b_n(1, L_x). \tag{4.7}$$

Now $\fint_M a_n(\xi, L)d\xi$ is defined to be

$$\int_M (1-\varphi)(\xi)a_n(\xi, L)d\xi + \fint_0^\infty \varphi(x)b_n(x)dx$$

with the same cut–off function, $\varphi$, as in the proof of Theorem 2.4.1.

In view of SAL, the $\alpha_n$ are $\neq 0$ at most if $\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m-n) - 1 \in \{-1, -2, \cdots\}$, thus $k := \frac{\nu}{\mu}(n-m) \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. In this case

$$\alpha_n = \frac{1}{k!}\frac{d^k}{dx^k} b_n(1, L_x)\Big|_{x=0} = \frac{1}{k!}\frac{d^k}{dx^k} x^{k+1} b_n(x)\Big|_{x=0}.$$

Hence, $\alpha_n$ is the coefficient of $x^{-1}$ in the asymptotic expansion of $b_n(x)$ as $x \to 0$.

Since $L$ is a differential operator, the $a_n(\xi, L)$ vanish if $n$ is odd. Thus the $\alpha_n$ vanish for $n$ odd, too. Likewise the $\alpha_n$ vanish for $n \neq m$ if $\nu \notin \mathbf{Q}$.

The coefficients $\beta_n$ are somewhat more subtle and they cannot be computed in terms of the local invariants. One has to know the kernel in a neighborhood of the cone tip. The $\beta_n$ in general depend on the choice of the closed extension of $L_0$. In contrast, the $\alpha_n$ and $\fint_M a_n(\xi, L)d\xi$ are independent of the closed extension. SAL yields

$$\beta_n = \fint_0^\infty \frac{\zeta^{n-1}}{n!}\left(\frac{d^n}{dx^n}\int_N \operatorname{tr}(e^{-\zeta^{-\nu}L_x}(1, p, 1, p))dp\Big|_{x=0}\right)d\zeta$$

The proof that the inner term is indeed differentiable is one of the main problems if one wants to attack Problem 2.4.4. [BS2] and [BL4] show what difficulties one has to overcome for proving this. They treat the Friedrichs extension of self–adjoint operators in $\mathrm{Diff}^{2,2}_{\mathrm{sm}}$ resp. $\mathrm{Diff}^{2,N}_{\mathrm{sm}}$. This is beyond the scope of this book. However, in contrast to [BS3], the method in [BL4] neither uses the Neumann series nor special functions. This gives some evidence to conjecture that the answer to Problem 2.4.4 is affirmative in general.

We cite the result of [BL4] in our terminology.

**Theorem 2.4.5** *Let* $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{1,\nu}_{\mathrm{sm}}(M, E)$ *be elliptic. Then* SAL *applies to the Friedrichs extension of* $\Delta_0 = P_0^t P_0$, $\Delta_0^{\mathcal{F}} = P^t_{0,\max} P_{0,\min}$, *and the asymptotic expansion* (4.6) *holds true.*

The situation becomes more convenient if the operator symbol is constant near the cone tip.

**Theorem 2.4.6** *Under the assumptions of Theorem* 2.4.1 *assume in addition*

$$L_0 = X^{-\nu}\sum_{k=0}^{\mu} A_k(-X\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k, \quad x < \varepsilon,$$

*i. e.* $A_k$ *is constant for* $x < \varepsilon$. *Moreover if* $L$ *is a scalable extension then we have the asymptotic expansion*

$$\operatorname{Tr}(g^* e^{-tL}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \fint_M \varphi_{j,n}(\xi)d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-m}{\mu}} + \frac{1}{\nu}\operatorname{Res}_0(\Gamma\hat{\zeta}_g(L))(0) - \frac{1}{\nu} b_m \log t.$$

**Proof** We proceed analogously as in the proof of Theorem 2.4.1 and obtain instead of (4.2)

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Tr}(g^*\varphi e^{-tL}) &= \int_0^\infty \varphi(x)\frac{1}{x}\int_N \operatorname{tr}((g^*e^{-tx^{-\nu}L})(1,p,1,p))dpdx\\ &=: \frac{1}{s}\int_0^\infty \varphi(x)F\Big(\frac{x}{s}\Big)dx\end{aligned}$$

with $s := t^{\frac{1}{\nu}}$ and

$$F(\xi) = \frac{1}{\xi}k_g(\xi^{-\nu}).$$

Lemma 2.2.4 yields

$$\begin{aligned}F(\xi) &= O(\xi^{\delta\nu-1}), \quad \xi\to 0,\\ F(\xi) &\sim_{\xi\to\infty} \sum_{n=0}^\infty b_n\,\xi^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m-n)-1},\end{aligned}$$

thus $F\in\mathcal{L}_{\delta\nu-1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}_+)$, $\operatorname{spec}_0(F)=\emptyset$. Since $\varphi\equiv 1$ near 0, we infer from Corollary 2.1.10

$$\operatorname{Tr}(g^*e^{-tL}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{n=0}^\infty b_n ⨍_0^\infty \varphi(x)x^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m-n)-1}dx\; t^{\frac{n-m}{\mu}} + ⨍_0^\infty F(x)dx - b_m\log(t^{\frac{1}{\nu}}).$$

In view of (2.6) the first summand has the desired form. Furthermore, using Lemma 2.1.5,

$$\begin{aligned}⨍_0^\infty F(x)dx &= ⨍_0^\infty \frac{1}{x}k_g(x^{-\nu})dx\\ &= \frac{1}{\nu}⨍_0^\infty \xi^{-1}k_g(\xi)d\xi\\ &= \frac{1}{\nu}\operatorname{Res}_0(Mk_g)(0) = \frac{1}{\nu}\operatorname{Res}_0(\Gamma\hat{\zeta}_g(L))(0).\end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 2.4.7** *Let $D\in\operatorname{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(M,E,F)$ be elliptic and $G$–invariant. In the representation*

$$D = X^{-\nu}\sum_{k=0}^\mu A_k(x)(-X\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k$$

*assume $A_k(x)=A_k(0)$ for $x<\varepsilon$. All closed extensions of $D$ are* FREDHOLM. *For $g\in G$ the function $\hat{\eta}_g(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(D),s)$ is regular at 0 and we have the index formula*

$$\operatorname{ind}(D_{\min},g) = \int_{M^g_\varepsilon}\omega_{D,g} + \frac{1}{\nu}\hat{\eta}_g(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(D),0). \tag{4.8}$$

*Here $M^g_\varepsilon = M^g\setminus((0,\varepsilon)\times N)$ and $\omega_{D,g}$ is the local $G$–equivariant index form of $D$.*

**Proof** We had already checked the FREDHOLM property in Proposition 1.3.16. Furthermore, $D^*_{\min}D_{\min}$, $D_{\min}D^*_{\min}$ are discrete and scalable. Hence the MCKEAN–SINGER formula holds:

$$\operatorname{ind}(D_{\min},g) = \operatorname{Tr}(g^*e^{-tD^*_{\min}D_{\min}} - g^*e^{-tD_{\min}D^*_{\min}}).$$

In view of Theorem 2.4.6 the coefficient of $\log t$ must vanish. By Corollary 2.2.4 this coefficient is

$$-\frac{1}{\nu}(b_m^+ - b_m^-) = -\frac{1}{\nu}\operatorname{Res}_1(\hat{\eta}_g(D))(0),$$

thus $\hat{\eta}_g(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(D), s)$ is regular at $s = 0$ and $b_m^+ = b_m^-$. Furthermore, we conclude from this

$$⨍_{(0,\varepsilon)\times N} \omega_{D,g} = 0$$

and the desired formula follows. □

Together with Proposition 2.3.13 we obtain the following special case.

**Theorem 2.4.8** *Under the assumptions of Theorem* 2.4.7*, let* $\mu = \nu = 1$ *and for* $x < \varepsilon$ *assume*

$$D = \frac{d}{dx} + X^{-1}S$$

*with self–adjoint* $S$*. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{ind}(D_{\min}, g) &= \int_{M_\varepsilon^g} \omega_{D,g} - \frac{1}{2}(\eta_g(S)(0) + \operatorname{tr} g_0^*) - \sum_{-\frac{1}{2}<\lambda<0} \operatorname{tr}(g_\lambda^*)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\geq 1} \alpha_k \operatorname{Res}_1(\eta_g(S))(2k).\end{aligned}$$

In view of $\operatorname{Res}_1(\hat{\eta}_g(\sigma_M^{\mu,\nu}(D)))(0) = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Res}_1(\eta_g(S))(0)$, we have also proved that $\eta_g(S)$ is regular at 0. As it is well–known, this result holds in greater generality [G, Sec. 4.3].

For Dirac operators $\omega_{D,g}$ can be expressed explicitly in terms of the curvature tensor [BGV, Theorem 4.3].

The structure of the formula above is very similar to the index formula of Atiyah, Patodi and Singer [APS]. See also [D2] for the equivariant case.

## 2.A An Asymptotic Relation for the Γ–Function

The purpose of this appendix is to derive a certain asymptotic relation for the Γ–function, which is crucial for the calculations in section 2.3 (cf. page 67). We follow essentially [BS2, p. 419] and [C3, p. 600]. However, we try to be as self–contained as possible and avoid to refer to handbooks of special functions. All we need are the Bernoulli polynomials and the asymptotic expansion of $\log\Gamma(z)$ as $z \to \infty$.

Unfortunately, in the literature the Bernoulli numbers are enumerated in different ways. Let $B_n$ be defined by

$$\frac{z}{e^z - 1} =: \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} z^n. \tag{A.1}$$

As it is well–known, $B_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$, $B_{2k+1} = 0$ for $k \geq 1$, and

$$b_k := (-1)^{k-1} B_{2k} > 0, \quad k \geq 1. \tag{A.2}$$

(A.1) or (A.2) are called the Bernoulli numbers by different authors. Furthermore, denote by $\psi_n(x)$ the (periodically extended) Bernoulli polynomial, which is normalized as follows:

$$\psi_1(x) = x - [x] - \frac{1}{2}, \quad \psi'_{n+1} = \psi_n, \quad \int_0^1 \psi_n(x)dx = 0. \tag{A.3}$$

Then we have

$$\psi_n(0) = \frac{B_n}{n!}. \tag{A.4}$$

**Lemma 2.A.1** *Let $K \subset \mathbf{C}$ be compact. Then we have, for $\nu \geq \nu_0$ and uniformly in $s \in K$, the asymptotic expansion*

$$\log \frac{\Gamma(\nu - s)}{\Gamma(\nu + s)} = -2s \log \nu + \frac{s}{\nu} + \sum_{k=2}^{n} R_k(s)\nu^{-k} + O(s\nu^{-n-1})$$

*with odd polynomials $R_k(s)$ of degree $\leq k+1$. More precisely, $R_2(s) = \frac{1}{6}s + \frac{1}{3}s^3$,*

$$\begin{aligned} R_k(s) &= \frac{2sB_k}{k} + O(s^3) \\ &= \begin{cases} O(s^3), & k \text{ odd}, \\ 2s\frac{(-1)^{k/2-1}}{k}b_{k/2} + O(s^3), & k \text{ even}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** We use the following representation of $\log \Gamma$, valid in the region $|\arg z| \leq \pi - \delta$, [R, Th. 12]

$$\log \Gamma(z) = (z - \tfrac{1}{2}) \log z - z + \tfrac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) - \int_0^\infty \frac{\psi_1(x)}{z+x}dx.$$

Integration by parts yields

$$\log \Gamma(z) = (z - \tfrac{1}{2}) \log z - z + \tfrac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{B_{k+1}}{k(k+1)} z^{-k} - n! \int_0^\infty \frac{\psi_{n+1}(x)}{(z+x)^{n+1}}dx.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\log \frac{\Gamma(\nu - s)}{\Gamma(\nu + s)} \\ = \;& (\nu - s - \tfrac{1}{2})(\log \nu + \log(1 - \frac{s}{\nu})) - (\nu + s - \tfrac{1}{2})(\log \nu + \log(1 + \frac{s}{\nu})) + 2s \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{B_{k+1}}{k(k+1)} \nu^{-k}\Big((1 - \frac{s}{\nu})^{-k} - (1 + \frac{s}{\nu})^{-k}\Big) \\ &- n! \int_0^\infty \psi_{n+1}(x)(\nu + x)^{-n-1}\Big((1 - \frac{s}{\nu + x})^{-n-1} - (1 + \frac{s}{\nu + x})^{-n-1}\Big)dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\nu_0$ be so large that for $s \in K, \nu \geq \nu_0$, we have $|s/\nu| \leq q < 1$. Then Taylor expansion of the summands yields

$$(\nu - s - \tfrac{1}{2})(\log \nu + \log(1 - \frac{s}{\nu})) - (\nu + s - \tfrac{1}{2})(\log \nu + \log(1 + \frac{s}{\nu})) + 2s$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -2s\log\nu - (\nu - s - \tfrac{1}{2})\frac{s}{\nu} - (\nu + s - \tfrac{1}{2})\frac{s}{\nu} + 2s - (\nu - s - \tfrac{1}{2})\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}\frac{1}{k}(\frac{s}{\nu})^k \\ &\quad -(\nu + s - \tfrac{1}{2})\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}\frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k}(\frac{s}{\nu})^k + O((\frac{s}{\nu})^{n+2}) \\ &= -2s\log\nu + \frac{s}{\nu} + \sum_{k=2}^{n} R_{1,k}(s)\nu^{-k} + O((\frac{s}{\nu})^{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

with odd polynomials $R_{1,k}$ of degree $\leq k+1$, $R_{1,2}(s) = \frac{1}{3}s^3$, $R_{1,k}(s) = O(s^3)$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{B_{k+1}}{k(k+1)}\nu^{-k}\Big((1 - \frac{s}{\nu})^{-k} - (1 + \frac{s}{\nu})^{-k}\Big) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{B_{k+1}}{k(k+1)}\nu^{-k}\Big(2k\frac{s}{\nu} + \sum_{j=2}^{n-k+2}\binom{-k}{j}((-1)^j - 1)(\frac{s}{\nu})^j + O\big((\frac{s}{\nu})^{n-k+3}\big)\Big) \\ &= s\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{2B_{k+1}}{k+1}\nu^{-k-1} + \sum_{k=4}^{n+1} R_{2,k}(s)\nu^{-k} + O(s^3\nu^{-n-2}) \end{aligned}$$

with odd polynomials $R_{2,k}$ of degree $\leq k-1$, $R_{2,k}(s) = O(s^3)$, and finally

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty |\psi_{n+1}(x)|(\nu + x)^{-n-1}\Big((1 - \frac{s}{\nu + x})^{-n-1} - (1 + \frac{s}{\nu + x})^{-n-1}\Big)dx \\ \leq\ & c\int_0^\infty (\nu + x)^{-n-1}\Big(\frac{2(n+1)s}{\nu + x} + O\Big(\frac{s^3}{(\nu + x)^3}\Big)\Big)dx \\ =\ & O(s\nu^{-n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 2.A.2** *Under the assumptions of the last lemma we have, for* $\nu \geq \nu_0$ *and uniformly in* $s \in K$*, the asymptotic expansion*

$$\frac{\Gamma(\nu - s + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu + s)} = \nu^{1-2s}\sum_{k=0}^{n} Q_k(s)\nu^{-k} + s\nu^{-2s}O(\nu^{-n})$$

*with certain polynomials* $Q_k$*. More precisely,*

$$Q_0 = 1, \quad Q_1 = 0, \quad Q_2(s) = -\tfrac{1}{2}s^2 + R_2(s) = \tfrac{1}{6}s - \tfrac{1}{2}s^2 + \tfrac{1}{3}s^3$$

*and, for* $k \geq 3$*,*

$$Q_k(s) = \begin{cases} O(s^2), & k \text{ odd,} \\ 2s\frac{(-1)^{k/2-1}}{k}b_{k/2} + O(s^2), & k \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

**Proof** The assertion follows immediately from

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma(\nu - s + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu + s)} &= (\nu - s)\exp\Big(-2s\log\nu + \frac{s}{\nu} + \sum_{k=2}^{n} R_k(s)\nu^{-k} + O(s\nu^{-n-1})\Big) \\ &= (\nu - s)\nu^{-2s}\Big(1 + \frac{s}{\nu} + \sum_{k=2}^{n} R_k(s)\nu^{-k} + O(s\nu^{-n-1}) + \\ &\quad \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{s}{\nu} + \sum_{k=2}^{n} R_k(s)\nu^{-k} + O(s\nu^{-n-1})\Big)^2 + \cdots\Big) \end{aligned}$$

□

We apply this asymptotics to the following situation:

Let $\nu_j > 0$ be an increasing sequence, $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \nu_j = \infty$, and let $(a_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}} \subset \mathbf{C}$ be a sequence with the properties

- $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j| \nu_j^{-p} < \infty$ for some $p \geq 0$.
- The Dirichlet series
$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \nu_j^{-s},$$
which is holomorphic for Re $s > p$, has a meromorphic extension with at most simple poles.

Let $n > p$. Then the function

$$\Phi(s) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_j - s + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu_j + s)} a_j$$

is holomorphic for $2\,\mathrm{Re}\; s - 1 > p$ and

$$\Phi(s) = \zeta(2s-1) + \sum_{l=1}^{[n/2]} \frac{(-1)^{l-1}}{l} b_l s \zeta(2l + 2s - 1) + sh(s) \tag{A.5}$$

with some function $h$, which is meromorphic for Re $s > p - n$ and holomorphic at $s = 0$. Hence, $\Phi$ has a meromorphic extension to the whole complex plane and the coefficients of the Laurent expansion at 0 to non–positive exponents can be expressed in terms of the residues of $\zeta$.

## Bibliographic Notes

As already mentioned in the summary the content of Section 2.1 is an elaboration of [BS1]. This paper has a lot of predecessors of which we mention [CU, Ca2].

The statement that scaling invariant second order differential equations and BESSEL functions are intimately related is almost a tautology. However, it was CHEEGER who discovered that the scaling invariance of second order FUCHS type operators can be exploited to achieve heat asymptotics and index theorems [C1, C3].

The explicit calculations in Section 2.3 are due to CHEEGER [C3, Sec. 3], who did them for the Gauß–Bonnet operator. CHOU [Chou] treated the spin Dirac operator and BRÜNING/SEELEY [BS3] generalized the methods to arbitrary (non–Dirac) operators of the form (3.5), resp. (3.9a,b). The "annihilator–creator" calculus, starting on page 62, is maybe new.

In loc. cit. ([C3, BS3, Chou]), the asymptotic expansion of the heat trace Theorem 2.4.1 is also proved for the respective class of operators. Before, CALLIAS [Ca2] proved the heat asymptotics for the operators (3.1) with $p \geq 1$. By Lemma 2.3.1 this means that $l_p$ is essentially self–adjoint. In the already mentioned paper [BS1] this was generalized in two directions. First, they allowed $p \geq 0$, i.e. they considered the Friedrichs extension of $l_p$. The reason for writing the potential in the form $(p^2 - 1/4)/x^2$ is that the operator

$$-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{c}{x^2}$$

is semi–bounded iff $c \geq -1/4$.

Secondly and more important, loc. cit. deals with variable potentials of the form $a(x)/x^2$, $a \geq -1/4$. They consider the operator

$$-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{a(x)}{x^2}$$

as a perturbation of the operator

$$-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{a(0)}{x^2}$$

and construct the resolvent via a Neumann series. Then they apply the SAL to this Neumann series.

The methods of [BS1] were generalized to operator valued potentials in [BS2, BS4, BL3, BL4].

For a somewhat different approach to these expansion problems cf. also [B1, B2].

It should be noted at this point that in the above mentioned literature ([C3, BS3, Chou]) a full asymptotic expansion is proved. Whether (4.1) can be generalized to a full asymptotic expansion remains as an open problem; see also the discussion after the proof of Theorem 2.4.1.

The case of a MELLIN symbol which is constant in a neighborhood of the cone tip is much simpler: Theorem 2.4.6 states a full asymptotic expansion in this situation. This is a direct generalization of the early results [Ca2, C3].

The index theorems Corollary 2.4.7 and Theorem 2.4.8 are direct consequences of the corresponding asymptotic expansion of the heat trace. Consequently, the bibliographic remarks made above apply to these results accordingly.

Unfortunately, the term $\hat{\eta}_g$ on the right hand side of (4.8) is not very explicit. However, as Theorem 2.4.8 and Section 2.3 show, it is the natural generalization of the non–local ingredient of the index formula for first order FUCHS type operators.

Theorem 2.4.8 is the $G$–equivariant version of the index theorem of BRÜNING and SEELEY [BS3]. See also [C3] and [Chou].

# Chapter III

# Relative Index Theory on Singular Manifolds

## Summary

In the last two chapters we investigated elliptic differential operators on manifolds which were singular but compact. Therefore we tried to recover as many results as possible from the case of a compact closed manifold.

In this chapter we deal with "complete manifolds" with singularities. By a complete manifold with singularities we understand a manifold which has certain "complete exits" and certain singularities in its interior. More precisely, we will consider the following situation (2.1):

> Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold, $\dim M = m$, and $U \subset M$ an open subset with smooth compact boundary $N := \partial U$, such that $\overline{M_0} := M \setminus U$ is complete.

As in the previous chapters, $U$ represents a neighborhood of the singularities of $M$. $\overline{M_0}$ represents the "complete exits".

We consider a first order symmetric elliptic differential operator

$$D : C_0^\infty(E) \longrightarrow C_0^\infty(E)$$

on $M$. The first problem we have to deal with is to construct self–adjoint extensions. If we assume that we know how to construct boundary conditions on $U$ as in the case of $U$ representing a conic singularity, we might hope that there is no boundary condition to impose at infinity. Of course, this is not true without further restrictions on $D$. It turns out that the appropriate notion to consider is the *propagation speed* of the operator $D$ (Definition 3.1.1 below). Roughly speeking, the propagation speed tells us how fast the support of a solution of the wave equation

$$\frac{\partial s}{\partial t} - iDs = 0 \tag{1}$$

propagates. The wave equation (1) has the following fundamental property: given initial data $\overline{s} \in C^\infty(E)$ then at least for small $t$ there is a solution $s_t \in C_0^\infty(E)$ with $s_0 = \overline{s}$. Moreover, the support of $s_t$ is contained in a neighborhood of $\overline{s}$. This property reflects the physical phenomenon that waves travel at a finite speed. Note that this existence result works within the class of $C^\infty$ sections with compact support. So we do not have to choose any "boundary" conditions. It was CHERNOFF's [Ch] brilliant idea to use this property of the wave equation to prove essential self–adjointness for certain differential operators on complete manifolds.

Due to the existence of the singularity set $U$ it may happen that waves "travel into the singularity" in finite time. Thus it will be of importance to find estimates from above on the time until a wave reaches a given set. Proposition 3.1.6 gives an estimate in terms of the propagation speed of the operator. Crucial for all these considerations is the local energy estimate Lemma 3.1.2 (cf. [Ch, Proposition 1.1]).

In Section 3.2 we introduce the notion of a CHERNOFF operator (Def. 3.2.1). The CHERNOFF condition guarantees that waves cannot reach infinity in finite time. This implies essential self–adjointness on complete manifolds (Corollary 3.2.6). For a complete manifold with singularities this means that the complete exits do not contribute any boundary conditions, see Proposition 3.2.5 for the precise statement.

Now let us fix a self–adjoint extension of $D$ which we again denote by $D$. In general we cannot expect $D$ to be FREDHOLM. In Section 3.2 we will state a simple FREDHOLM criterion.

The rest of the chapter is devoted to relative index theory. If $D$ is FREDHOLM and if it is *supersymmetric* which means that it can be written

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_- \\ D_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then we may ask for a formula for $\text{ind} D_+$. Due to the existence of the complete ends there is probably no nice formula for $\text{ind} D_+$. Instead one considers a pair of such operators, $D_1, D_2$, which coincide at infinity. Then it is possible to find an expression for the difference of the indices

$$\text{ind} D_{1,+} - \text{ind} D_{2,+}.$$

The point is that in general the individual heat kernels

$$e^{-tD_{j,+}^2}$$

will not be of trace class. However, we will show in Section 3.4 that

$$\int_M \left| (e^{-tD_1^2} D_1^l)(x,x) - (e^{-tD_2^2} D_2^l)(x,x) \right| dx < \infty.$$

Even more we will show that, in a certain sense, this integral converges uniformly in $t$. This allows to prove an analogue of the MCKEAN–SINGER formula, namely

$$\text{ind} D_{1,+} - \text{ind} D_{2,+} = \int_M \text{str}(e^{-tD_1^2}(x,x) - e^{-tD_2^2}(x,x))dx.$$

Note that in this situation the MCKEAN–SINGER formula is nontrivial and establishing it is the main part of this chapter. Once we have established it we can easily derive relative index theorems for those $U$ where we know the local expansion of the heat kernel. We would like to point out that the method we present here is due to DONNELLY [D1] and our exposition follows loc. cit. very closely. Further bibliographic comments can be found at the end of the chapter.

As in the previous chapters we consider the whole situation to be equivariant under a group action. Although this is new, the remark at the end of the summary of Chapter 2 applies accordingly. The main new feature of our exposition is the incorporation of the singularity set $U$ into the theory.

## 3.1 Wave Equation and Bounded Propagation Speed

We consider a Riemannian manifold, $M$, and a symmetric elliptic differential operator of order 1,

$$D : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E), \tag{1.1}$$

acting between sections of the hermitian vector bundle $E$.

In this chapter we will be dealing mostly with $1^{\text{st}}$ order operators, thus it is more convenient to omit the normalizing factor $i$ in the definition of the symbol. Hence we put, for $\xi \in T_p^*M$, $e \in E_p$,

$$\sigma_D(\xi)(e) := D(\varphi s)(p),$$

where $\varphi \in C^\infty(M), \varphi(p) = 0, d\varphi(p) = \xi$ and $s \in C_0^\infty(E), s(p) = e$. For arbitrary $\varphi \in C^\infty(M), s \in C_0^\infty(E)$, the product rule now reads

$$D(\varphi s) = \sigma_D(d\varphi)(s) + \varphi Ds.$$

Note that in this notation the symbol of a symmetric operator is antisymmetric.

**Definition 3.1.1** *For $\Omega \subset M$ we put*

$$v(\Omega) := \max\{|\sigma_D(\xi)|;\, \xi \in T_p^*M, |\xi| \le 1, p \in \Omega\}, \tag{1.2}$$

*resp. if $\Omega = B_r(p_0)$ denotes the closed ball of radius $r$*

$$v_{p_0}(r) := v(B_r(p_0)).$$

*$v(\Omega)$ is called the propagation speed of $D$ on $\Omega$.*

This terminology will be justified below (Lemma 3.1.2 and Proposition 3.1.6).

Let

$$\frac{\partial s}{\partial t} - iDs = 0, \quad s_0 = \overline{s} \tag{1.3}$$

be the wave equation. Under certain assumptions which will be specified later, there will be a unique solution $s_t$ of (1.3) for given initial data $\overline{s} \in C_0^\infty(E)$.

The uniqueness follows from the fact that the wave operator is $L^2$–norm preserving. Namely if either $s_t \in C_0^\infty(E)$ or $s_t$ lies in the domain of a self–adjoint extension of $D$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\|s_t\|^2 &= (\frac{\partial}{\partial t}s_t|s_t) + (s_t|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}s_t) \\ &= (iDs_t|s_t) + (s_t|iDs_t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $s_0 \in C_0^\infty(E)$ then the next lemma shows that $s_t \in C_0^\infty(E)$ at least for small $t$.

**Lemma 3.1.2** *Let $p_0 \in M$ and suppose that $B_R(p_0)$ lies in a geodesic coordinate system. If $s \in C^\infty([-T,T], C^\infty(E))$ is a solution of the wave equation* (1.3)*, then*

$$\int_{B_{R-ct}(p_0)} < s_t(p), s_t(p) > dp\,, \quad c = v_{p_0}(R) \tag{1.4}$$

*is a decreasing function of $t$.*

**Proof** We define the vector field $Y_t \in C^\infty(TM)$ by

$$< Y_{t,p}, X_p > := -i < s_t(p), \sigma_D(X_p^b) s_t(p) > \ .$$

$Y$ is real, because $\sigma_D(X_p^b)$ is antisymmetric. We calculate with $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(M)$

$$\begin{aligned}(\operatorname{div} Y_t|\varphi) &= -(d^t Y_t^b|\varphi) = -(Y_t^b|d\varphi) = -(Y_t|(d\varphi)^\#)\\ &= i\int_M < s_t(p), \sigma_D(d\varphi(p)) s_t(p) > dp\\ &= i\int_M < s_t(p), D(\varphi s_t)(p) - \varphi(p) D s_t(p) > dp\\ &= i\int_M (< D s_t(p), s_t(p) > - < s_t(p), D s_t(p) >)\overline{\varphi} dp\,,\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\operatorname{div} Y_t = i(< D s_t, s_t > - < s_t, D s_t >).$$

Differentiation of (1.4) with respect to $t$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_{R-ct}(p_0)} < iD s_t(p), s_t(p) > + < s_t(p), iD s_t(p) > dp\\ &-c\int_{\partial B_{R-ct}(p_0)} < s_t(p), s_t(p) > \mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\\ = &\int_{\partial B_{R-ct}(p_0)} -c|s_t(p)|^2 + < Y_{t,p}, \nu(p) > \mathrm{d}\sigma(p)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where $\nu(p)$ denotes the exterior normal and we have used the divergence theorem. Now we have

$$| < Y_{t,p}, \nu(p) > | = | < s_t(p), \sigma_D(\nu(p)) s_t(p) > | \le c|s_t(p)|^2$$

and the assertion follows. □

**Proposition 3.1.3** *Let $\overline{D}$ be a self–adjoint extension of $D$. Then, to given initial data $\overline{s} \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{D})$ there exists a unique solution $s. : \mathbf{R} \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{D})$ of the wave equation* (1.3)*. If $s_0 \in \mathcal{D}^\infty(\overline{D})$ we have $s.(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}, C^\infty(E))$.*

**Proof** This is a consequence of STONE's theorem. We have

$$s_t = e^{it\overline{D}} s_0.$$ □

From now on we assume that there exists a self–adjoint extension of $D$. We fix such an extension; for simplicity it will again be denoted by $D$.

We generalize Definition 3.1.1:

**Definition 3.1.4** *Let $U \subset M$ be an open subset with smooth compact boundary. We put*

$$v_U(r) := \sup\{|\sigma_D(\xi)|\,;\, \xi \in T^*_pM\,,\, |\xi| \le 1\,,\, \mathrm{dist}\,(p,U) \le r\}\,.$$

*If $s_0 \in \mathcal{D}^\infty(D)$ and $\mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_0) > 0$ then we put for $\varrho > 0$*

$$T_U(\varrho, s_0) := \sup\{t \,|\, \mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_{t'}) \ge \varrho \quad \textit{for} \quad 0 \le t' \le t\} \in \mathbf{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$$

*and*

$$\begin{aligned} T(U, s_0) \;&:=\; T_U(0, s_0) := \sup_{\varrho > 0} T_U(\varrho, s_0) \\ &=\; \sup\{t \,|\, \mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_{t'}) > 0 \quad \textit{for} \quad 0 \le t' \le t\}, \end{aligned}$$

*which is the so–called entry–time of $s_0$ in $U$. Obviously, $T_U(\cdot, s_0)$ is a decreasing $[0,\infty]$–valued function. Here $[0,\infty] := [0,\infty) \cup \{\infty\}$ carries the obvious topology and order structure. It is homeomorphic to $[0,1]$.*

*If $U = \{p\}$ then we write $T_p(\cdot,\cdot)$ instead of $T_{\{p\}}(\cdot,\cdot)$.*

**Lemma 3.1.5** *If the function $T_U(\cdot, s_0)$ is real valued then it is left continuous.*

**Remark** Note that $t \mapsto \mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_t)$ is left continuous. Hence we also have

$$\mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_{T_U(\varrho, s_0)}) \ge \varrho. \tag{1.5}$$

**Proof** Pick $\varrho_0, \varepsilon > 0$ and put $T_0 := T_U(\varrho_0, s_0)$. By Definition of $T_U(\cdot, s_0)$, there exists a $t \in (T_0, T_0 + \varepsilon)$, such that $\mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_t) < \varrho_0$. Then we have, for $\mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_t) < \varrho < \varrho_0$,

$$T_0 = T_U(\varrho_0, s_0) \le T_U(\varrho, s_0) \le t \le T_0 + \varepsilon,$$

which proves the assertion. □

**Proposition 3.1.6** *Let $U \subset M$ be an open subset with smooth compact boundary and let $s_t \in \mathcal{D}^\infty(D)$ be a solution of the wave equation with $R := \mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_0) > 0$. Suppose there is a $r_0 > 0, r_0 < R$, such that for each $p \in M \setminus U$ with $\mathrm{dist}\,(U,p) < R$, the ball $B_{r_0}(p)$ is contained in a geodesic coordinate patch. Then, for $0 \le \varrho \le R$,*

$$T_U(\varrho, s_0) \ge \int_\varrho^R \frac{dr}{v_U(r)} + T_U(R, s_0) \ge \int_\varrho^R \frac{dr}{v_U(r)}\,.$$

*Note that $v_U(r) > 0$ since $D$ is elliptic.*

**Proof** If $T_U(\varrho, s_0) = \infty$ then there is nothing to prove. W. l. o. g. assume $T_U(\cdot, s_0)$ to be real valued.

In view of (1.5) we have $\mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_{T_U(\varrho, s_0)}) \ge \varrho > 0$ for $0 < \varrho \le R$. Hence for $t \le T_U(\varrho, s_0)$

$$\mathrm{dist}\,(U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_t) = \mathrm{dist}\,(\partial U, \mathrm{supp}\ s_t). \tag{1.6}$$

Pick $p \in \partial U =: N$ and consider a ball $B_{r_0}(p), r_0 < R$, which is contained in a geodesic coordinate patch. Since $r_0 < R$ this ball does not meet supp $s_0$. From Lemma 3.1.2 we infer, for $0 < \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le r_0$,

$$\operatorname{supp} s_{T_p(\varrho_2,s_0)+(\varrho_2-\varrho_1)/v_p(\varrho_2)} \cap \overset{\circ}{B}_{\varrho_1}(p) = \emptyset,$$

thus

$$T_p(\varrho_1, s_0) \ge T_p(\varrho_2, s_0) + \frac{\varrho_2 - \varrho_1}{v_p(\varrho_2)}\,.$$

Since this inequality holds for any $0 < \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le r_0$, it implies the estimate

$$T_p(\varrho_1, s_0) - T_p(\varrho_2, s_0) \ge \int_{\varrho_1}^{\varrho_2} \frac{dr}{v_p(r)} \ge \int_{\varrho_1}^{\varrho_2} \frac{dr}{v_U(r)}, \quad 0 \le \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le r_0. \tag{1.7}$$

In view of (1.6) we have for $0 < \varrho < R$

$$T_U(\varrho, s_0) = \inf\{T_p(\varrho, s_0) \,|\, p \in \partial U\},$$

thus we infer from (1.7)

$$T_U(\varrho_1) \ge \int_{\varrho_1}^{\varrho_2} \frac{dr}{v_U(r)} + T_U(\varrho_2), \quad 0 \le \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le r_0. \tag{1.8}$$

To prove that (1.8) holds for $0 < \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le R$ we introduce

$$A = \{\varrho \in [0, R] \,|\, T_U(\varrho_1, s_0) - T_U(\varrho_2, s_0) \ge \int_{\varrho_1}^{\varrho_2} \frac{dr}{v_U(r)} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \le \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le \varrho\}\,.$$

By definition, $A$ is an interval and by the preceding considerations $[0, r_0] \subset A$. Since $T_U(\cdot, s_0)$ is left continuous, $A$ is closed on its right end and hence closed. We consider $\xi := \sup A$ and *assume* $\xi < R$. We will show that then $[\xi, \xi + \min(r_0, R - \xi)] \subset A$ leading to a contradiction.

Obviously, it suffices to prove

$$T_U(\varrho_1, s_0) - T_U(\varrho_2, s_0) \ge \int_{\varrho_1}^{\varrho_2} \frac{dr}{v_U(r)} \quad \text{for} \quad \xi \le \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 \le \xi + \min(r_0, R - \xi). \tag{1.9}$$

To prove (1.9) we pick $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition of $T_U$, there exists a $\delta, 0 < \delta < \varepsilon$, and a $p_\varepsilon \in M \setminus U$ with

$$\operatorname{dist}(p_\varepsilon, U) < \varrho_1, \quad s_{T_U(\varrho_1,s_0)+\delta}(p_\varepsilon) \ne 0$$

hence

$$T_{p_\varepsilon}(0, s_0) \le T_U(\varrho_1, s_0) + \varepsilon. \tag{1.10}$$

As above one derives, for $0 \le \tau_1 < \tau_2 \le \min(r_0, R - \xi)$,

$$T_{p_\varepsilon}(\tau_1, s_0) \ge T_{p_\varepsilon}(\tau_2, s_0) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \frac{dr}{v_{p_\varepsilon}(r)}\,.$$

Note that

$$v_{p_\varepsilon}(\tau) \le v_U(\varrho_1 + \tau), \quad T_U(\xi + \tau) \le T_{p_\varepsilon}(\tau),$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} T_U(\varrho_1) - T_U(\varrho_2) &\geq T_{p_\varepsilon}(0) - \varepsilon - T_{p_\varepsilon}(\varrho_2 - \varrho_1) \\ &= \int_0^{\varrho_2 - \varrho_1} \frac{dr}{v_{p_\varepsilon}(r)} - \varepsilon \\ &\geq \int_{\varrho_1}^{\varrho_2} \frac{dr}{v_U(r)} - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon$ was arbitrary we reach the conclusion. □

**Remark** The assumptions of this proposition are obviously satisfied if $\{p \in M \setminus U \mid \operatorname{dist}(U, p) < R\}$ is contained in a compact submanifold with boundary. In particular this holds true if $M \setminus U$ is complete.

**Proposition and Definition 3.1.7** *For an open subset $W \subset M$ we put*

$$T(U, W) := \inf\{T(U, s) \mid s \in C_0^\infty(E|W)\}\,.$$

*Then, under the assumptions of the preceding proposition, the following estimate holds*

$$T(U, W) \geq \int_0^{\operatorname{dist}(U,W)} \frac{dr}{v_U(r)}\,.$$

Now we exploit the notion of entry–time to prove estimates for functions of $D$.

**Proposition 3.1.8** *Let $U \subset M$ be open with smooth compact boundary. Then, for $f \in C_0(\mathbf{R})$, $\hat{f} \in L^1(\mathbf{R})$, and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^\infty(D)$, $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} \varphi, U) > 0$, the following estimate holds*

$$\|f(D)\varphi\|_{L^2(U,E)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{|\xi| \geq T(U,\varphi)} |\hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \, \|\varphi\|.$$

**Proof** By definition of entry–time we compute for arbitrary $\psi \in C_0^\infty(E|U)$

$$\begin{aligned} |(f(D)\varphi|\psi)| &= \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)(e^{i\xi D}\varphi|\psi) d\xi\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{|\xi| \geq T(U,\varphi)} |\hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \, \|\varphi\| \, \|\psi\|\,. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Example** We consider the function

$$f_{p,t}(x) := x^p e^{-tx^2}\,, \quad p \in \mathbf{Z}_+\,,\ t > 0. \tag{1.11}$$

The Fourier transform turns out to be

$$\hat{f}_{p,t}(\xi) = t^{-(p+1)/2} P_p\Big(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}}\Big) e^{-\xi^2/4t} \tag{1.12}$$

with a polynomial $P_p(z) \in \mathbf{C}[z]$, $\deg P \leq p$. Consequently

$$|\hat{f}_{p,t}(\xi)| \leq c_p t^{-\frac{p+1}{2}} e^{-\xi^2/6t} \tag{1.13}$$

with a constant $c_p$ depending on $p$.

A consequence of these inequalities is the following lemma, which is fundamental for kernel estimates based on bounded propagation speed.

**Lemma 3.1.9** a) *For $\varrho > 0, t > 0$ we have the estimates*

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq\varrho} |\hat{f}_{p,t}(\xi)| d\xi \leq \frac{c}{\varrho} t^{\frac{1-p}{2}} e^{-\varrho^2/6t}, \tag{1.14}$$

*and*

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq\varrho} |\hat{f}_{p,t}(\xi)| d\xi \leq c\varrho^{-p}. \tag{1.15}$$

b) *For $t_0 > 0, \varrho_0 > 0$ there exists a $c = c(p, t_0, p_0) > 0$, such that, for $\varrho \geq \varrho_0, 0 < t \leq t_0$,*

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq\varrho} |\hat{f}_{p,t}(\xi)| d\xi \leq \frac{c}{\varrho} e^{-\varrho^2/8t}. \tag{1.16}$$

**Proof** a) Integration by parts yields the well–known estimate

$$\int_x^\infty e^{-y^2} dy = \frac{1}{2x} e^{-x^2} - \frac{1}{2} \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{y^2} e^{-y^2} dy < \frac{1}{2x} e^{-x^2}, \quad x > 0.$$

This implies

$$\int_x^\infty e^{-\alpha y^2} dy < \frac{1}{2\alpha x} e^{-\alpha x^2}, \quad x, \alpha > 0. \tag{1.17}$$

We apply this inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi|\geq\varrho} |\hat{f}_{p,t}(\xi)| d\xi &\leq c_p t^{-(p+1)/2} \int_{|\xi|\geq\varrho} e^{-\xi^2/6t} d\xi \\ &\leq 6 c_p t^{-(p-1)/2} \frac{1}{\varrho} e^{-\varrho^2/6t} \end{aligned}$$

and the first inequality is proved.

To prove the second inequality we have to distinguish the cases $p = 0$, $p = 1$, and $p > 1$. If $p = 1$ then the first estimate implies the second one. If $p = 0$ then

$$\int_{|\xi|\geq\varrho} |\hat{f}_{0,t}(\xi)| d\xi \leq c_0 t^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-\xi^2/6t} d\xi = \sqrt{3\pi} c_0.$$

Now let $p > 1$: in view of (1.14) we maximize the function

$$\varphi(t) = t^{(1-p)/2} e^{-\varrho^2/6t}.$$

It is a routine matter to check that $\varphi$ takes its maximum at $t = \frac{\varrho^2}{3(p-1)}$. Hence

$$\max_{t>0} \varphi(t) = C\varrho^{1-p}$$

and a) is proved.

b) is an immediate consequence of a). $\square$

## 3.2 Chernoff Operators

The following data will be considered throughout this chapter.

> Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold, $\dim M = m$, and $U \subset M$ an open subset with smooth compact boundary $N := \partial U$, such that $\overline{M_0} := M \setminus U$ is complete and (2.1)
>
> $D : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$ a 1st order symmetric elliptic differential operator. (2.2)

Moreover we put $M_0 := M \setminus \overline{U}$.

**Definition 3.2.1** *D will be called a* CHERNOFF *operator if its propagation speed satisfies*

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{v_U(r)} = \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

**Lemma 3.2.2** *Let $M$ be as in (2.1). Then there exists a function $\varrho \in C^\infty(M_0)$ with*

$$\begin{aligned} |\varrho(p) - \operatorname{dist}(p, N)| &\leq c\,,\ p \in M_0, \\ |\nabla \varrho(p)| &\leq 2\,,\ p \in M_0 \end{aligned}$$

*for a suitable $c > 0$.*

**Proof** We can find a complete manifold without boundary, $\widetilde{M}$, with $M_0 \subset \widetilde{M}$ (e. g. the double of a manifold $M_1$ with $M_0 \subset M_1$ and $M_1 \setminus M_0 = [0,1) \times N$ with product metric near $\{1\} \times N$; such a manifold $M_1$ certainly exists). We choose $p_0 \in N$ and an approximation $\varrho$ of the distance function of $p_0$ on $\widetilde{M}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} |\varrho(p) - d(p, p_0)| &\leq \varepsilon \\ |\nabla \varrho(p)| &\leq 2\,. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, by the compactness of $N$, $\varrho|M_1$ does the job. □

**Lemma 3.2.3** *Let $f : \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathbf{R}_+, f(0) > 0$, be an increasing function, $\int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{f(r)} = \infty$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $(\chi_m) \subset C^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ having the following properties:*

(i) $\chi_m|(-\infty, m] = 1\,,\ 0 \leq \chi_m \leq 1$.

(ii) $\chi_m(x) = 0\,,\ x \geq x_0$, *for suitable* $x_0 = x_0(m)$.

(iii) $|\chi_m'(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{m f(x)}$.

**Proof** Obvious. □

**Lemma 3.2.4** *Let $M$ be as in* (2.1) *and $D$ a* CHERNOFF *operator on $M$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $(\psi_m) \subset C_0^\infty(\overline{M}_0)$ having the following properties:*

(i) $0 \le \psi_m \le 1$ *and* $\psi_m(p) = 1$ *if* $\operatorname{dist}(p, N) \le m$,

(ii) $|\nabla\psi_m(p)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{m\, v_U(\operatorname{dist}(p,N))}$ ,

(iii) $|\sigma_D(d\psi_m)(p)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{m}$.

**Proof** For $f(x) := v_U(x+c)$ and suitable $\delta > 0$, let $(\chi_m)$ be the sequence of functions of Lemma 3.2.3 with $\varepsilon$ replaced by $\delta$. Choose $\varrho, c$ according to Lemma 3.2.2. We choose an integer $k > c$ and put $\psi_m := \chi_{m+k} \circ \varrho$. Then 1. is obviously satisfied. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla\psi_m(p)| &= |\chi'_{m+k}(\varrho(p))\nabla\varrho(p)| \\ &\le \frac{2\delta}{(m+k)f(\varrho(p))} \\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon}{mf(\varrho(p))}, \end{aligned}$$

if $\delta < \varepsilon/2$ and 2. is proved. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_D(d\psi_m)(p)| &\le v_U(\operatorname{dist}(p,N))|\nabla\psi_m(p)| \\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 3.2.5** *Let $M$ be as in* (2.1) *and $D$ a* CHERNOFF *operator on $M$. If $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$, $\operatorname{supp} f \subset M_0$, then there exists a sequence $\varphi_n \in C_0^\infty(E|M_0)$ with $\varphi_n \to f$, $D\varphi_n \to Df$, i. e. $f \in \mathcal{D}((D|M_0)_{\min})$.*

**Proof** Let $\psi_n$ be as above. Then $\psi_n f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$, because

$$D(\psi_n f) = \sigma_D(d\psi_n)(f) + \psi_n Df\,.$$

Together with Lemma 3.2.4 this implies that $\psi_n f \to f$ in the graph topology of $D_{\max}$. Since $\operatorname{supp}(\psi_n f)$ is compact, Lemma 1.1.15 yields $\psi_n f \in \mathcal{D}((D|M_0)_{\min})$, thus $f \in \mathcal{D}((D|M_0)_{\min})$, too. □

**Corollary 3.2.6** *If $U = \emptyset$, i. e. $M$ is complete, then $D$ is essentially self–adjoint.*

Now we are going to investigate FREDHOLM properties of CHERNOFF operators. We begin with the functional analytic characterization of the FREDHOLM property:

**Proposition 3.2.7** *Let $D$ be a self–adjoint operator in the* HILBERT *space $H$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *$D$ is a* FREDHOLM *operator* $\mathcal{D}(D) \to H$.

(ii) $0 \notin \operatorname{spec}_{\text{ess}}(D)$.

(iii) $0 \notin \operatorname{spec}_{\text{ess}}(D^2)$.

(iv) ker $D$ *is finite dimensional and there is a* $c > 0$*, such that, for all* $x \in (\ker D)^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{D}(D)$*,*

$$\|Dx\| \geq c\|x\|.$$

(v) *If* $(x_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(D)$ *with* $\|x_n\|_H$ *bounded and* $Dx_n$ *convergent then* $(x_n)$ *has a convergent subsequence.*

*Here* $\operatorname{spec}_{\text{ess}}$ *denotes the essential spectrum of an operator.*

**Proof** The equivalences (i) ⇔ (ii) ⇔ (iii) ⇔ (iv) are well–known.

(iv) ⇒ (v): Let $(x_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(D)$, $\|x_n\|_H \leq K$ and $Dx_n \to y$. We decompose

$$x_n := x_n^0 + x_n^1$$

with $x_n^0 \in \ker D$ and $x_n^1 \in \ker D^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{D}(D)$. Then

$$\|x_n^1 - x_m^1\| \leq \frac{1}{c}\|Dx_n^1 - Dx_m^1\| = \frac{1}{c}\|Dx_n - Dx_m\|,$$

i. e. $(x_n^1)$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence converges in $H$. Since $\|x_n^0\| \leq \|x_n\| \leq K$, $(x_n^0)$ is a bounded sequence in the finite–dimensional Hilbert space ker $D$. This sequence has a convergent subsequence.

(v) ⇒ (iv): If ker $D$ were infinite dimensional, we could choose an orthonormal system $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ in ker $D$. Obviously this contradicts $(v)$.

Assume, no such $c > 0$ exists as asserted. Then we choose for $n \in \mathbf{N}$ a $x_n \in \ker D^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{D}(D)$, $\|x_n\| = 1$, and $\|Dx_n\| < \frac{1}{n}$. By $(v)$ we may assume that $x_n$ converges, $x := \lim x_n$. Since $D$ is a closed operator, we have $Dx = 0$, thus

$$x \in \ker D \cap \ker D^{\perp} = 0,$$

which contradicts $\|x\| = \lim \|x_n\| = 1$. □

The somewhat unusual characterization (v) will be used several times in the sequel.

**Proposition 3.2.8** *Let* $M$ *be as in* (2.1) *and* $D_0$ *a* Chernoff *operator on* $M$*. Let* $D$ *be a self–adjoint extension of* $D_0$*.*

1. *The following two statements are equivalent*

(i) *We have*

$$D^2 = P + R$$

*with a non–negative closed operator* $P$ *and* $R \in C^{\infty}(\operatorname{End}E) \cap \mathcal{L}(L^2(E))$*, where* $R$ *is positive at infinity, i. e. there exists a* $U$*–compact subset* $K \supset U$*, such that* $(R|M \setminus K) \geq c > 0$*.*

(ii) *There exists a* $U$*–compact set* $K \supset U$ *and a* $c > 0$*, such that for* $s \in \mathcal{D}(D)$*,* $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} s, K) > 0$*, we have*

$$\|Ds\| \geq c\|s\|.$$

2. *If* $D$ *is a* Fredholm *operator, then the two equivalent statements of* 1. *are true.*

**Proof** 1. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): After enlarging $K$ we may assume that $K$ has smooth boundary. Since $R$ is bounded, we have $\mathcal{D}(D^2) = \mathcal{D}(P)$ and for $s \in \mathcal{D}(D^2)$, $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} s, K) > 0$, we conclude

$$\|Ds\|^2 = (Ds|Ds) = (D^2 s|s) = (Ps|s) + (Rs|s) \geq c\|s\|^2.$$

By Proposition 3.2.5, $C_0^\infty(M \setminus K, E)$ is dense in $\{s \in \mathcal{D}(D) \,|\, \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} s, K) > 0\}$ with respect to the graph norm of $D$ and the assertion follows.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ with $\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 < \frac{c^2}{4}$. We choose $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{M_0})$ according to Lemma 3.2.4, such that $\psi|K \equiv 1$ and

$$|\sigma_D(d\psi)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We put $\chi := 1 - \psi$. Furthermore, let $\varphi \in C^\infty(M)$, $\operatorname{supp} \varphi \subset \{p \,|\, \chi(p) = 1\}$, $0 \leq \varphi \leq \frac{c^2}{2}$, and $\varphi|(M \setminus K') \equiv \frac{c^2}{2}$, where $K' \supset K$ is a $U$–compact set which is large enough. Now we infer for $s \in \mathcal{D}(D^2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\varphi s|s) &= (\varphi\chi s|\chi s) \leq \frac{c^2}{2}(\chi s|\chi s) \leq \frac{1}{2}(D(\chi s)|D(\chi s)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left|\|Ds\|^2 + 2\mathrm{Re}(\sigma_D(d\chi)s|\chi Ds) + \|\sigma_D(d\chi)s\|^2\right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(\|Ds\|^2 + 2\varepsilon\|s\|\|Ds\| + \varepsilon^2\|s\|^2) \\
&\leq (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\|Ds\|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2}{2}\|s\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

consequently $R := \varphi - \frac{\varepsilon+\varepsilon^2}{2}$ does the job.

2. Assume 1. (ii) were not true. By virtue of Proposition 3.2.7 (v) we obtain a contradiction if we can construct an orthonormal system $(s_n) \subset C_0^\infty(E|M_0)$ with $\|Ds_n\| < 1/n$. Since 1. (ii) is not true with $c = 1$, there exists a $s_1 \in C_0^\infty(M_0, E)$ with $\|s_1\| = 1$ and $\|Ds_1\| < 1$. Proposition 3.2.5 guarantees that $s_1$ can be chosen in $C_0^\infty(M_0, E)$. Assume that $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ are already constructed. Then we choose a $U$–compact set $K \supset U \cup \operatorname{supp} s_1 \cup \cdots \cup \operatorname{supp} s_n$ with smooth boundary. Since 1. (ii) is not true for $K$ with $c = 1/(n+1)$, there exists a $s_{n+1} \in C_0^\infty(E|M \setminus K)$ with $\|s_{n+1}\| = 1$, $\|Ds_{n+1}\| < 1/(n+1)$. □

If, in addition, $D$ has the Rellich property over $U$ (cf. Definition 1.4.2) then we obtain the following FREDHOLM criterion:

**Proposition 3.2.9** *Under the assumptions of Proposition* 3.2.8 *assume that D has the Rellich property over U. Then D is a* FREDHOLM *operator if it satisfies one of the equivalent conditions in Proposition* 3.2.8 1. *I. e. for* CHERNOFF *operators with the Rellich property, the statements under* 1. *and* 2. *in Proposition* 3.2.8 *are equivalent.*

**Proof** We choose a $U$–compact $K \supset U$, such that for $s \in \mathcal{D}(D)$, $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} s, K) > 0$, we have

$$\|Ds\| \geq c\|s\|\,.$$

Moreover, let $K \subset \overset{\circ}{K'}$ with $K'$ $U$–compact and $\chi \in C^\infty(M)$ with $\chi|K \equiv 1$, $\chi|(M \setminus K') \equiv 0$, $\operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp}\chi, \partial K') > 0$. Let $\widetilde{\chi}$ have the same properties as $\chi$ and $\widetilde{\chi}|\operatorname{supp}\chi \equiv 1$. We use the criterion (v) of Proposition 3.2.7 and consider $(s_m) \subset \mathcal{D}(D)$ with $\|s_m\| \leq c_1$ and $(Ds_m)$ convergent. Since $\chi s_m \in \mathcal{KD}(D, \overset{\circ}{K'})$, by assumption w. l. o. g. we may assume that $(\chi s_m)$ and $(\widetilde{\chi} s_m)$ converge. Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1-\chi)(s_m - s_n)\| &\leq \frac{1}{c}\|D((1-\chi)(s_m - s_n))\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c}\|\sigma_D(d\chi)\|_\infty \|\widetilde{\chi} s_m - \widetilde{\chi} s_n\| + \frac{1}{c}\|Ds_m - Ds_n\|\,, \end{aligned}$$

i. e. $((1-\chi)s_m)$ is a Cauchy sequence and the assertion follows. □

**Remark** Proposition 3.2.8 and Proposition 3.2.9 also give a FREDHOLM criterion for not necessarily symmetric differential operators of order 1. Let $D_0$ be an arbitrary elliptic differential operator of order 1 and $D$ a closed extension. In order to be able to apply Proposition 3.2.8, $DD^*$ and $D^*D$ have to satisfy the assumptions of 1. (i), and $D, D^*$ have to satisfy the assumptions of 1. (ii). This follows easily from the consideration of the operator

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ D^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

## 3.3 Some Kernel Estimates

In this section we prove some estimates for the heat kernels of certain operators.

**Proposition 3.3.1** *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $\Delta_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$ a positive elliptic differential operator of order $d$. Assume that $\Delta \geq 0$ is a self–adjoint extension with $0 \notin \operatorname{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(\Delta)$. We consider the orthogonal projection*

$$H : L^2(E) \to \ker \Delta$$

*and $\widetilde{\Delta} := \Delta + H \geq \varepsilon := \min(1, \min \operatorname{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(\Delta)) > 0$. Then for $t_0 > 0, l \in \mathbf{Z}_+$, and every compact set $K \subset M$, there exists a $c > 0$, such that*

$$\left(\int_M |(\widetilde{\Delta}^l e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}}(x,y)|^2 dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c e^{-t\varepsilon}, \quad t \geq t_0,\ x \in K, \tag{3.1}$$

$$|(\widetilde{\Delta}^l e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}}(x,y)| \leq c e^{-t\varepsilon}, \quad t \geq t_0,\ x, y \in K. \tag{3.2}$$

*If $l \geq 1$ then* (3.1) *and* (3.2) *also hold for $\Delta$ instead of $\widetilde{\Delta}$.*

**Proof** Let $kd > \dim M/2$. Then we apply Lemma 1.1.17 for $s \in L^2(E)$ and $x \in K$ and find

$$\begin{aligned} |(\widetilde{\Delta}^l e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}} s)(x)| &\leq c(\|\widetilde{\Delta}^l e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}} s\| + \|\Delta^k \widetilde{\Delta}^l e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}} s\|) \\ &\leq c(\sup_{\xi \geq \varepsilon} |\xi^l e^{-t\xi}| + \sup_{\xi \geq \varepsilon} |\xi^{k+l} e^{-t\xi}|)\|s\| \\ &\leq c' e^{-t\varepsilon}\|s\|, \quad t \geq t_0. \end{aligned}$$

In the case $l \geq 1$ the same computation works for $\Delta$ instead of $\widetilde{\Delta}$. Now the first inequality (3.1) is a consequence of the Riesz representation theorem; (3.2) follows from (3.1) and the semi-group property of $e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}}$. □

This proposition still holds – with the same proof – for a properly supported pseudodifferential operator $\Delta_0$ (cf. [Sh, Chapter I]).

Using the entry–time, it is possible to prove more subtle estimates:

**Proposition 3.3.2** *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and let $D_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$ be a 1st order symmetric elliptic differential operator on $E$. Assume that $D$ is a self–adjoint extension of $D_0, \Delta := D^2$. Moreover let $A \in \operatorname{Diff}^d(E)$ and $X \subset M$ compact with smooth boundary. Then, for $\varrho_0 > 0$ and $W := \{y \in M \mid \operatorname{dist}(X, y) > \varrho_0\}$, we have*

$$\sup_{t>0, x \in X} \left(\int_W |Ae^{-t\Delta}(x,w)|^2 dw\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

**Proof** Let $U \supset X$ be an open neighborhood, such that $T(U, W) > 0$ and $k > \dim M/2$. Then application of Proposition 3.1.8, Lemma 3.1.9 a), and Lemma 1.1.17 yields, for $x \in X$ and $s \in C_0^\infty(E|W)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |Ae^{-t\Delta}s(x)| &\leq c\|Ae^{-t\Delta}s\|_{H^k(U,E)} \\ &\leq c\|e^{-t\Delta}s\|_{H^{k+d}(U,E)} \\ &\leq c(\|e^{-t\Delta}s\|_{L^2(U,E)} + \|D^{k+d}e^{-t\Delta}s\|_{L^2(U,E)}) \\ &\leq c\left(\int_{|\xi| \geq T(U,W)} |\hat{f}_{0,t}(\xi)| d\xi + \int_{|\xi| \geq T(U,W)} |\hat{f}_{k+d,t}(\xi)| d\xi\right)\|s\| \\ &\leq c\|s\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the assertion again is a consequence of the Riesz representation theorem. □

**Proposition 3.3.3** *Under the assumptions of the preceding proposition let $U \supset X$ be an open neighborhood. Then for $t_0, \varrho_0 > 0$ there exists a constant $c$, such that, for $0 < t \le t_0$ and $W \subset M$ with $T(U, W) =: \varrho \ge \varrho_0$,*

$$\sup_{x \in X} \left( \int_W |Ae^{-t\Delta}(x, w)|^2 dw \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{c}{\varrho} e^{-\varrho^2/8t}. \tag{3.3}$$

**Proof** The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.3.2. One only has to use Lemma 3.1.9 b) instead of Lemma 3.1.9 a). □

**Proposition 3.3.4** *Let $X$ be a locally compact space, $\mu$ a positive Radon measure and $H \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(X, \mu))$ a finite–rank operator with kernel*

$$h(x, y) = \sum_{i,j} h_i(x) g_j(y), \quad h_i, g_j \in L^2(X, \mu).$$

*Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open subset $U \subset X$, $X \setminus U$ compact, such that for every* Carleman *operator (cf. [We, Sec. 6.2]) $E \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(X, \mu))$ the following holds*

$$\int_U \left| \int_X h(x, y) E(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| d\mu(x) \le \varepsilon \|E\|.$$

**Proof** We have

$$\int_X h(x, y) E(x, y) d\mu(y) = \sum_{i,j} h_i(x) (Eg_j)(x)\,,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \left| \int_X h(x, y) E(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| d\mu(x) &\le \sum_{i,j} \int_U |h_i(x)| |(Eg_j)(x)| d\mu(x) \\ &\le \sum_{i,j} \|h_i\|_{L^2(U,\mu)} \|E\| \|g_j\|_{L^2(X,\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the regularity of Radon measures we have

$$\|h_i\|_{L^2(X,\mu)} = \lim_{K \subset X compact} \|h_i\|_{L^2(K,\mu)}.$$

and we reach the conclusion. □

## 3.4 Pairs of Chernoff Operators which coincide at Infinity

For dealing with index problems the "super" terminology has the advantage that one can stay within the class of self–adjoint operators. Thus we will make use of the "super" terminology from now on:

**Definition 3.4.1** a) *A vector bundle $E \to M$ over a manifold is called a super bundle if there is a direct sum decomposition $E = E^+ \oplus E^-$. The operator*

$$\tau := \mathrm{Id}_{E^+} \oplus (-\mathrm{Id}_{E^-}) \in C^\infty(\mathrm{End}\, E)$$

*will be called the grading operator.*

*(Differential) operators will be called odd/even if they anticommute/commute with the grading operator $\tau$.*

b) *Let $E = E^+ \oplus E^-$ be a hermitian super bundle with grading operator $\tau \in C^\infty(\mathrm{End} E)$. A differential operator $D_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^d(E)$ is called supersymmetric if it is symmetric and odd.*

For more details about "super" structures on manifolds we refer the reader to [BGV, Chap. I].

With respect to the decomposition $E = E^+ \oplus E^-$, $D_0$ has the form

$$D_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_{0,-} \\ D_{0,+} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $D_{0,-} = D_{0,+}^t$. Hence, a supersymmetric operator $D_0$ has a self–adjoint extension $D$: namely, choose an arbitrary closed extension, $D_+$, of $D_{0,+}$ and put $D_- := D_+^*$. This self–adjoint extension is still odd. Obviously, all superself–adjoint extensions of $D_0$ are of this form. In the sequel we will avoid to use the monster word "superself–adjoint". If we speak of a self–adjoint extension, $D$, of a supersymmetric operator then we will always assume $D\tau = -\tau D$, without mentioning it explicitly.

**Definition 3.4.2** *Let $M_1, M_2$ be Riemannian manifolds as in* (2.1) *and $D_{1,0}$, $D_{2,0}$ supersymmetric* CHERNOFF *operators on $M_1, M_2$. We say that $D_{1,0}, D_{2,0}$ coincide at infinity, if there exists an isometry*

$$F : M_1 \setminus U_1 \to M_2 \setminus U_2\,, \tag{4.2a}$$

*which lifts to an even bundle isometry*

$$F_* : E_1|(M_1 \setminus U_1) \to E_2|(M_2 \setminus U_2), \tag{4.2b}$$

*such that*

$$D_{1,0} = F_*^{-1} \circ D_{2,0} \circ F_*. \tag{4.2c}$$

Here, $F_*$ also denotes the isometry $L^2(E_1) \to L^2(E_2)$ induced by $F$.

For simplicity we will suppress $F$ and identify $M_1 \setminus U_1, M_2 \setminus U_2$. This set will be denoted by $S$. Moreover we put

$$E_1|S = E_2|S =: E\,, \quad D_{1,0}|S = D_{2,0}|S =: D\,, \quad \tau_1|S = \tau_2|S =: \tau. \tag{4.3}$$

Furthermore, we will admit that the whole situation is equivariant, i. e. there is a compact LIE group $G$, acting as isometry group on $M_j$; $S$ is G–invariant and the operators $D_j, \tau_j$ are G–invariant, too. For $g \in G$ and $p \in M_j$, the induced isometry on $D$ is denoted by

$$g^* : E_{j,g(p)} \to E_{j,p}. \tag{4.4}$$

The map

$$C_0^\infty(E_j) \ni s \mapsto g^* \circ s \circ g \in C_0^\infty(E_j) \tag{4.5}$$

is also denoted by $g^*$. It extends to a unitary map $L^2(E_j) \to L^2(E_j)$.

The aim of this section is to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.4.3** *With the notations introduced above let $D_{1,0}, D_{2,0}$ be G–equivariant* CHERNOFF *operators which coincide at infinity. Let $D_1, D_2$ be G–equivariant self–adjoint extensions which are assumed to be* FREDHOLM. *Then, for $l \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a G–invariant open subset $W \subset S$ with $S \setminus W$ compact, such that for all $t > 0$ and all $g \in G$*

$$\int_W \left|(g^* e^{-tD_1^2} D_1^l)(x,x) - (g^* e^{-tD_2^2} D_2^l)(x,x)\right| dx < \varepsilon.$$

**Proof** We put $\Delta_j := D_j^2$. By Proposition 3.2.7 we have $0 \notin \operatorname{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(\Delta_j)$. Let $(h_j)_{j=1,\cdots,n}$ be an orthonormal basis of ker $\Delta_1$. The orthogonal projection

$$H_1 : L^2(E) \to \ker\, \Delta_1$$

is an operator with kernel

$$H_1(x,y) = \sum_j h_j(x) \otimes h_j(y)^*,$$

i. e.

$$\begin{aligned}(H_1 s)(x) &= \sum_j h_j(x)(h_j|s) \\ &= \sum_j h_j(x) \int_{M_1} < h_j(y), s(y) > dy.\end{aligned}$$

Put $K_j(t) := e^{-t\Delta_1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{K}_1(t) &:= e^{-t\Delta_1} - H_1 \\ &= e^{-t\widetilde{\Delta}_1} - e^{-t} H_1,\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\Delta}_1 := \Delta_1 + H_1$ (cf. Proposition 3.3.1).

We choose $G$–invariant cut–off functions $\phi, \psi, \chi \in C^\infty(S)$ as follows:

$\phi \equiv 0$ in a neighborhood of $\partial S$, $\phi \equiv 1$ outside some $G$–invariant compact set. (4.6)

$$\psi \text{ has the same properties as } \phi \text{ and in addition } \psi|\operatorname{supp}\phi \equiv 1. \tag{4.7}$$

$$\chi \in C_0^\infty(S) \text{ with } \chi|\operatorname{supp}(1-\phi) \equiv 1. \tag{4.8}$$

We extend $\phi, \psi$ by 0, $\chi$ by 1, to $M_1$ and define

$$E_t := \chi e^{-t\Delta_1}(1-\phi) + \psi e^{-t\Delta_2}\phi. \tag{4.9}$$

Moreover, we put

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t + \Delta_1)E_t &= [\Delta_1, \chi]e^{-t\Delta_1}(1-\phi) + [\Delta_2, \psi]e^{-t\Delta_2}\phi \\ &=: R_t \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

and obtain

$$H_1 R_t = H_1 \partial_t E_t. \tag{4.11}$$

DUHAMEL's principle now yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_t &= \int_0^t e^{-s\Delta_1} R_{t-s} ds + e^{-t\Delta_1} \\ &= \int_0^t \overline{K}_1(s) R_{t-s} ds - \int_0^t H_1 \partial_s E_{t-s} ds + \overline{K}_1(t) + H_1 \\ &= \int_0^t \overline{K}_1(s) R_{t-s} ds + H_1 E_t + \overline{K}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $x, y \in S \setminus (\operatorname{supp}(1-\phi) \cup \operatorname{supp}\chi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &K_2(t,x,y) - \overline{K}_1(t,x,y) = E_t(x,y) - \overline{K}_1(t,x,y) \\ &\quad = \int_0^t \int_M \overline{K}_1(s,x,z) R_{t-s}(z,y) dz ds + \int_M H_1(x,z) E_t(z,y) dz, \end{aligned}$$

and, for $g \in G$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(g^*K_2)(t,x,x) - (g^*\overline{K}_1)(t,x,x) = g^*K_2(t,gx,x) - g^*\overline{K}_1(t,gx,x) \\ &= \int_0^t \int_M g^*\overline{K}_1(s,gx,z) R_{t-s}(z,x) dz ds + \int_M g^*H_1(gx,z) E_t(z,x) dz \end{aligned} \tag{4.12a}$$

and, for $l \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(g^*D_2^l K_2)(t,x,x) - (g^*D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(t,x,x) \\ &= (g^*D_2^l K_2)(t,x,x) - (g^*D_1^l K_1)(t,x,x) \\ &= \int_0^t \int_M (g^*D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(s,x,z) R_{t-s}(z,x) dz ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12b}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3.3.4 we now obtain, for open $W_1 \subset S$ with $S \setminus W_1$ compact,

$$\int_{W_1} \left| \int_M g^* H_1(gx,z) E_t(z,x) dz \right| dx \leq \|E_t\| \sum_j \|g^* h_j\|_{L^2(E)} \|h_j\|_{L^2(E|W_1)} < \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \tag{4.13}$$

for suitable $W_1$, where $W_1$ obviously can be chosen $G$–invariant and independent of $g$.

Next let $Z \subset S$ be a fixed $G$–invariant compact set with $\operatorname{supp} \nabla\psi \subset Z$ and $W_2 \subset W_1$ $G$–invariant with $S \setminus W_2$ compact, such that $\phi \equiv 1$ on $W_2$. We get in view of (4.12a,b), (4.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{W_2} \left|(g^* D_2^l K_2 - g^* D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(t,x,x)\right| dx \\
\leq\ & \frac{\varepsilon}{5} + \int_{W_2} \left| \int_0^t \int_Z (g^* D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(s,x,z)[\Delta_2,\psi] e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x) dz ds \right| dx. \qquad (4.14)
\end{aligned}$$

We choose $t_0 > 0$ and split the $s$–integration, where $t_1 \geq t_0$ will be chosen later. Cauchy–Schwarz and Propositions 3.3.1, 3.3.2 yield:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{W_2} \left| \int_{t_1}^t \int_Z (g^* D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(s,x,z)[\Delta_2,\psi] e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x) dz ds \right| dx \\
\leq\ & \int_{t_1}^t \int_Z \left( \int_{W_2} |(g^* D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(s,x,z)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{W_2} |[\Delta_2,\psi] e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dz ds \\
\leq\ & C \int_{t_1}^\infty e^{-s\delta} ds \qquad (4.15) \\
=\ & \frac{C}{\delta} e^{-t_1\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = \min(1, \min \operatorname{spec}_e(\Delta_1))$. Here, $C$ depends on $t_0$ and $Z$ but is independent of $t_1$.

We can choose $t_1$ large enough such that the last expression is $< \varepsilon/5$ for all $t \geq t_1$. Then we estimate the remaining integral from 0 to $t_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{W_2} \left| \int_0^{t_1} \int_Z (g^* D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(s,x,z)[\Delta_2,\psi] e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x) dz ds \right| dx \\
\leq\ & \int_{W_2} \left| \int_0^{t_1} \int_Z (g^* D_1^l K_1)(s,x,z)[\Delta_2,\psi] e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x) dz ds \right| dx \qquad (4.16) \\
& + \delta_{l,0} \int_{W_2} \left| \int_0^{t_1} \int_Z (g^* H_1)(x,z)\psi(z) \partial_s e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x) dz ds \right| dx \\
=:\ & I(W_2) + II(W_2).
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
II(W_2) \ \leq\ & \int_{W_2} \left| \int_Z (g^* H_1)(x,z)\psi(z) e^{-(t-t_1)\Delta_2}(z,x) dz \right| dx \\
& + \int_{W_2} \left| \int_Z (g^* H_1)(x,z)\psi(z) e^{-t\Delta_2}(z,x) dz \right| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

As in (4.13) one checks that $W_2$ can be chosen in such a way that $II(W_2) < \varepsilon/5$ for all $t \geq t_1$.

Let $W_3 \subset W_2$ have the same properties as $W_2$. Analogous to (4.15) we infer, using Proposition 3.3.3, that

$$\begin{aligned}
I(W_3) \ \leq\ & \int_0^{t_1} \int_Z \left( \int_{W_3} |(g^* D_1^l K_1)(s,x,z)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{W_3} |[\Delta_2,\psi] e^{-(t-s)\Delta_2}(z,x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dz ds \\
\leq\ & C \int_0^{t_1} \int_Z \left( \int_{W_3} |g^*(D_1^l K_1(s,gx,z)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dz ds \\
\leq\ & \frac{C_1}{T(Z',W_3)} e^{-T(Z',W_3)^2/8t_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

where $Z' \supset Z$ is a small, relative compact neighborhood. Finally, we use the CHERNOFF property: namely, if $W_3$ is suitably chosen, we can make $T(Z', W_3)$ arbitrary large such that finally $I(W_3) < \varepsilon/5$. We note that because $\overline{K}_1 = K_1 - H_1$ (cf. (4.13)) there exists a $W_4 \subset W_3$ with the same properties as $W_3$, such that for all $t > 0$

$$\int_{W_4} \left|(g^* D_1^l \overline{K}_1)(t,x,x) - (g^* D_1^l K_1)(t,x,x)\right| dx < \varepsilon/5.$$

If $t \leq t_1$, we repeat the computation from (4.16) with $t$ instead of $t_1$ and we are done.□

## 3.5 The Relative McKean–Singer Formula

In this section we consider a manifold $M$ as in (2.1) and a $G$–equivariant supersymmetric CHERNOFF operator $D_0$ on $M$. In addition, we assume that $D$ has the property (SE) over $U$ (see Definition 1.4.10). We note some kernel estimates which follow from Lemma 1.4.5.

**Lemma 3.5.1** 1. *For $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$, such that for $x \in U$*

$$\Big(\int_M |D^k e^{-tD^2}(x,y)|^2 dy\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varrho(x)(\frac{c_1}{t^k} + \frac{c_2}{t^{k+l}}).$$

*Here, $\varrho(x)$ is the function from the singular elliptic estimate* (1.4.4).

2. *If $\chi \in C_U^\infty(M)$,* $\operatorname{supp}(d\chi)$ *compact, then $\chi D^k e^{-tD^2}, D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi$ are* HILBERT–SCHMIDT *operators and their* HILBERT–SCHMIDT *norm satisfies*

$$\|\chi D^k e^{-tD^2}\|_{HS} = \|D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi\|_{HS} \leq \frac{c_1}{t^k} + \frac{c_2}{t^{k+l}}.$$

**Proof** 1. is an immediate consequence of Lemma 1.4.5.

2. Obviously, we have $(\chi D^k e^{-tD^2})^* = D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi$, hence it suffices to prove the assertion for $\chi D^k e^{-tD^2}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{M\times M} |\chi(x)(D^k e^{-tD^2})(x,y)|^2 dxdy \\ =\ & \int_M |\chi(x)|^2 \int_M |D^k e^{-tD^2}(x,y)|^2 dydx \\ \leq\ & \int_M |\chi(x)|^2 \varrho(x)^2 dx (\frac{c_1}{t^k} + \frac{c_2}{t^{k+l}})^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

An immediate consequence is

**Lemma 3.5.2** *Let $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in C_U^\infty(M)$,* $\operatorname{supp}(d\chi_j)$ *compact. Then the operator $\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2$ is trace class and the following estimate holds*

$$|(\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2)(x,y)| \leq \chi_1(x)\chi_2(y)\varrho(x)\varrho(y)\frac{1}{t^k}(c_1 + \frac{c_2}{t^l})^2. \tag{5.1}$$

This lemma has an important consequence. The estimate (5.1) shows that we can differentiate

$$\int_M \chi_1(gx)(g^* e^{-tD^2})(x,x)dx, \quad g \in G, \tag{5.2}$$

with respect to $t$ under the integral.

**Proposition 3.5.3** *With the denotations of the last lemma we have*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(D\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2) = \mathrm{Tr}(\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2 D).$$

**Proof** By the preceding considerations the operator $(I+D^2)\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2$ is trace class and $D(I+D^2)^{-1}$ is bounded, consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(D\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2) &= \mathrm{Tr}(D(I+D^2)^{-1}(I+D^2)\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2)\\ &= \mathrm{Tr}((I+D^2)\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2 D(I+D^2)^{-1})\\ &= \mathrm{Tr}(\chi_1 D^k e^{-tD^2}\chi_2 D).\end{aligned}$$

□

**Definition 3.5.4** *Given a trace class operator, $T \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(E))$, its supertrace is denoted by* $\mathrm{Str}(T) := \mathrm{Tr}(\tau T)$. *Given a bundle endomorphism, $R \in \mathrm{End}(E_x)$, we put* $\mathrm{str}(R) := \mathrm{tr}(\tau(x)R)$.

*Note that $\tau$ is the grading automorphism of the super bundle $E$.*

**Proposition 3.5.5** *Let $\chi_1, \chi_2$ be as before and denote by $H$ the orthogonal projection onto* $\ker D$. *If $D$ is a* FREDHOLM *operator then we have, for $g \in G$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi_1 e^{-tD^2}\chi_2) &= \int_M \chi_1(gx)\chi_2(x)\mathrm{str}((g^*H)(x,x))dx\\ &= \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi_1 H\chi_2).\end{aligned}$$

**Proof** Since $(e^{-t/2D^2}-H)^2 = e^{-tD^2}-H$, Lemma 1.4.5 implies, for $x,y\in U$,

$$\begin{aligned}|(e^{-tD^2}-H)(x,y)| &\le \varrho(x)\varrho(y)(\sup_{\xi\ge\varepsilon} e^{-\xi t/2} + \sup_{\xi\ge\varepsilon}\xi^{l/2}e^{-\xi t/2})^2\\ &\le C\varrho(x)\varrho(y)e^{-t\varepsilon/2},\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon = \min \mathrm{spec}_{\mathrm{ess}}(D^2)$. From this the assertion follows. □

**Definition 3.5.6** *Let $D_{1,0}, D_{2,0}$ be supersymmetric* CHERNOFF *operators which coincide at infinity. Let $D_1, D_2$ be self–adjoint extensions which are assumed to be* FREDHOLM *operators. We put for $g \in G$*

$$\kappa_g(t) = \int_M \mathrm{str}((g^*e^{-tD_1^2})(x,x) - (g^*e^{-tD_2^2})(x,x))dx.$$

$\kappa_g(t)$ is well–defined in view of Theorem 3.4.3. If we choose cut–off functions $\chi, \psi, \phi$ as in (4.6)-(4.8) then we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_g(t) \;:=\; & \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_1^2}(1-\phi)) - \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_2^2}(1-\phi))\\ &+\int_M \mathrm{str}((g^*\psi(e^{-tD_1^2}-e^{-tD_2^2})\phi)(x,x))dx. \qquad (5.3)\end{aligned}$$

This shows in particular that the right hand side of (5.3) is independent of the choice of $\chi, \psi, \phi$.

Moreover, by Theorem 3.4.3 we can choose $\chi, \psi, \phi$ in such a way that the last integral in (5.3) is $< \varepsilon$ for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, simultaneously for all $t > 0$ and $g \in G$.

**Proposition 3.5.7** *$\kappa_g(t)$ is constant.*

**Proof** Let $0 < t_0 < t_1$ be given. We want to show that $\kappa_g(t_0) = \kappa_g(t_1)$. Pick $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\chi, \psi, \phi$ in such a way that the last summand in (5.3) is $< \varepsilon/3$ for all $t > 0$. Now we consider

$$\kappa_1(t) := \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_1^2}(1-\phi)) - \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_2^2}(1-\phi)).$$

As noted beforere, $\kappa_1$ is differentiable and we can differentiate under the integral sign. Since $\chi|\operatorname{supp}(1-\phi) \equiv 1$ we obtain, using that $D_1, D_2$ are odd operators,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\kappa_1(t) &= -\mathrm{Str}(g^*D_1\chi D_1 e^{-tD_1^2}(1-\phi)) + \mathrm{Str}(g^*D_2\chi D_2 e^{-tD_2^2}(1-\phi))\\ &= \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_1^2}D_1(1-\phi)D_1) - \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_2^2}D_2(1-\phi)D_2)\\ &= -\frac{d}{dt}\kappa_1(t) + \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_1^2}D_1\sigma_{D_1}(d\phi)) - \mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi e^{-tD_2^2}D_2\sigma_{D_2}(d\phi)).\end{aligned}$$

$D_1, D_2$ coincide on $\operatorname{supp}(d\phi)$, hence

$$|2\frac{d}{dt}\kappa_1(t)| \le \|\sigma_D(d\phi)\| \mathrm{rank}\, E \int_{\mathrm{supp}\ d\phi} |(g^*e^{-tD_1^2}D_1 - g^*e^{-tD_2^2}D_2)(x,x)|dx.$$

By Lemma 3.2.4, we can make $\|\sigma_D(d\phi)\|$ arbitrary small and by Theorem 3.4.3, the integral can be made arbitrary small by choosing the support of $d\phi$ appropriately. In any case, we can choose $\phi$ in such a way that

$$|\frac{d}{dt}\kappa_1(t)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{3(t_1-t_0)}$$

for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. Then $|\kappa_1(t_1) - \kappa_1(t_0)| \le \varepsilon/3$, and consequently

$$|\kappa_g(t_1) - \kappa_g(t_0)| \le |\kappa_g(t_1) - \kappa_1(t_1)| + \varepsilon/3 + |\kappa_1(t_0) - \kappa_g(t_0)| < \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we end up with $\kappa_g(t_1) = \kappa_g(t_0)$. □

**Theorem 3.5.8** *Given $D_1, D_2$ as in Definition* 3.5.6*, the relative* McKean–Singer *formula holds*

$$\kappa_g(t) = \mathrm{ind}(D_{1,+}, g) - \mathrm{ind}(D_{2,+}, g).$$

**Proof** Since $\kappa_g(t)$ is constant, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \kappa_g(t) = \mathrm{ind}(D_{1,+}, g) - \mathrm{ind}(D_{2,+}, g).$$

For that purpose let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\chi, \psi, \phi$ such that the last summand in (5.3) is $< \varepsilon/2$ for all $t > 0$. Moreover, let $H_1, H_2$ be the orthogonal projections onto $\ker D_1, \ker D_2$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} & |\kappa_g(t) - \mathrm{ind}(D_{1,+}, g) + \mathrm{ind}(D_{2,+}, g)|\\ =\ & |\kappa_g(t) - \int_M \mathrm{str}((g^*H_1 - g^*H_2)(x,x))dx|\\ \le\ & |\mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi(e^{-tD_1^2} - H_1)(1-\phi))| + |\mathrm{Str}(g^*\chi(e^{-tD_2^2} - H_2)(1-\phi))|\\ & +\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \mathrm{rg}E\int_M |(g^*\psi H_1\phi)(x,x)|dx + \mathrm{rg}E\int_M |(g^*\psi H_2\phi)(x,x)|dx.\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.3.4, we can choose $\psi, \phi$ such that the last two summands are $< \varepsilon/2$. By virtue of Proposition 3.5.5 the first two summands tend to 0 as $t \to \infty$. □

**Definition 3.5.9** *For $D_1, D_2$ as above the relative $G$–index is defined to be*

$$\mathrm{ind}(D_1, D_2, g) := \mathrm{ind}(D_{1,+}, g) - \mathrm{ind}(D_{2,+}, g).$$

Finally, we state the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.5.10** (Local Relative Index Theorem)*Let $M$ be a Riemannian $G$–manifold as in* (2.1). *Let $D_{1,0}$, $D_{2,0}$ be supersymmetric $G$–invariant* CHERNOFF *operators which coincide at infinity. Let $D_1, D_2$ be $G$–invariant self–adjoint extensions. Assume that $D_1, D_2$ are* FREDHOLM *operators and that they have the property (SE) over $U$. Then, for $g \in G$,*

$$\mathrm{ind}(D_1, D_2, g) = \lim_{t\to 0}\left(\int_{U_1}\mathrm{str}((g^* e^{-tD_1^2})(x,x))dx - \int_{U_2}\mathrm{str}((g^* e^{-tD_2^2})(x,x))dx\right).$$

**Proof** Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. We choose again $\chi, \psi, \phi$, such that the last summand in (5.3) is $< \varepsilon/2$ for all $t > 0$. Since $\mathrm{ind}(D_1, D_2, g) = \kappa_g(t)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathrm{ind}(D_1, D_2, g) - \int_{U_1}\mathrm{str}((g^* e^{-tD_1^2})(x,x))dx + \int_{U_2}\mathrm{str}((g^* e^{-tD_2^2})(x,x))dx|\\ \leq\;& \varepsilon/2 + \left|\int_S \mathrm{str}((g^*\chi e^{-tD_1^2}(1-\phi))(x,x))dx - \int_S \mathrm{str}((g^*\chi e^{-tD_2^2}(1-\phi))(x,x))dx\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi, 1-\phi$ have compact support in $S$, we can apply Theorem 1.1.18. Using the denotations there, we find

$$\int_S \mathrm{str}((g^*\chi e^{-tD_j^2}(1-\phi))(x,x))dx \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\int_{N_j}(1-\phi(x))\varphi_{j,n}(x)dx\, t^{\frac{n-m_j}{2}}.$$

Here, the $\varphi_{j,n}(x)$ are invariants, which depend only on the symbol of $D$, its derivatives, and $g$. Hence, these invariants of $D_1$ and $D_2$ coincide on $S$. This yields

$$\int_S \mathrm{str}((g^*\chi e^{-tD_1^2}(1-\phi))(x,x)) \;-\; \mathrm{str}((g^*\chi e^{-tD_2^2}(1-\phi))(x,x))dx = O(t^N), \quad t \to 0$$

for arbitrary large $N$. Therefore, we reach the conclusion. □

## 3.6 Relative Index Theorems

The statement of the Local Relative Index Theorem 3.5.10 can be made more precise if the heat kernel has an asymptotic expansion over $U_j$, too. The simplest situation is the one where $U_j$ itself is regular, e.g. $M_j$ is complete.

**Theorem 3.6.1** (The G–equivariant relative index theorem for CHERNOFF operators on complete manifolds) *Let $M_j$ be complete Riemannian manifolds as in Definition* 3.4.2. *Let $D_1, D_2$ be $G$–equivariant supersymmetric* CHERNOFF *operators which coincide at infinity. Assume that the unique self–adjoint extensions of $D_1, D_2$ are* FREDHOLM *operators. Then, for $g \in G$,*

$$\mathrm{ind}(D_1, D_2, g) = \int_{U_1\cap M_1^g}\omega_{D_1,g}(x)dx - \int_{U_2\cap M_2^g}\omega_{D_2,g}(x)dx,$$

*where $\omega_{D_j,g}$ denotes again the local $G$–equivariant index form.*

**Proof** By Theorem 1.1.18,

$$\int_{U_l} \operatorname{str}((g^* e^{-tD_l^2})(x,x))dx, \quad l = 1,2$$

has an asymptotic expansion in powers of $t$. In view of Theorem 3.5.10, only the coefficient of $t^0$ can survive and we reach the conclusion. □

We note an immediate corollary, which follows from the supplement to Theorem 1.1.18.

**Corollary 3.6.2** *Let* $\dim M \equiv 1 (\operatorname{mod} 2)$. *If* $G = \{1\}$ *or* $M$ *is oriented and* $G$ *orientation preserving, then*

$$\operatorname{ind}(D_1, D_2, g) = 0.$$

Furthermore, we note the corresponding statement for conical singularities.

**Theorem 3.6.3** *Let* $D_1, D_2$ *G–equivariant* CHERNOFF *operators on the Riemannian* $G$*–manifolds* $M_1, M_2$. *Assume that* $D_1, D_2$ *coincide at infinity in the sense of Definition* 3.4.2. *Assume that the set* $U_l, l = 1,2$ *has only conical singularities in its interior and near the singularities,* $D_j$ *has the form*

$$D_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + X^{-1} S_j$$

*with self–adjoint* $S_j$. *Moreover, assume* $D_{1,\min}, D_{2,\min}$ *to be* FREDHOLM. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ind}(D_{1,\min}, g) - \operatorname{ind}(D_{2,\min}, g) = \int_{U_1 \cap M^g_{1,\varepsilon}} \omega_{D_1,g} - \int_{U_2 \cap M^g_{2,\varepsilon}} \omega_{D_2,g} \\
-\frac{1}{2}(\eta_g(S_1)(0) - \eta_g(S_2)(0) + \operatorname{tr}(g^*|\ker S_1) - \operatorname{tr}(g^*|\ker S_2)) \\
- \sum_{-\frac{1}{2}<\lambda<0} (\operatorname{tr}(g^*|\ker(S_1 - \lambda)) - \operatorname{tr}(g^*|\ker(S_2 - \lambda))) \\
+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\geq 1} \alpha_k \operatorname{Res}_1(\eta_g(S_1))(2k) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\geq 1} \alpha_k \operatorname{Res}_1(\eta_g(S_2))(2k).
\end{aligned}$$

**Proof** From $D_1, D_2$ construct two supersymmetric operators as described in (4.1) and apply Theorem 3.5.10, Theorem 2.4.6, and Proposition 2.3.13. □

We will see more applications of Theorem 3.5.10 in Section 4.4.

## Bibliographic Notes

As already mentioned in the introduction the discovery that the local energy estimate, Lemma 3.1.2, can be used to prove essential self–adjointness is due to CHERNOFF [Ch]. However, the energy estimate itself is maybe older and we do not attempt to trace back its origin. In loc. cit. CHERNOFF introduced what we decided to call a CHERNOFF operator (Definition 3.2.1) and he proved that on a complete manifold all powers of a CHERNOFF operator are essentially self–adjoint. Every DIRAC operator is a CHERNOFF operator since the leading symbol of a DIRAC operator has modulus one.

Hence Chernoff's result in particular applies to Dirac operators. Independently, Wolf [Wo] proved essential self–adjointness for the Dirac operator and its square.

The concept of the entry–time and Proposition 3.1.6 is due to the author. However, for complete manifolds Proposition 3.1.6 is implicitly contained in Chernoff's paper, since it is the obvious motivation for Definition 3.2.1. Estimates based on the entry–time like Proposition 3.1.8 and Lemma 3.1.9 are due to Cheeger, Gromov and Taylor [CGT].

Proposition 3.2.8 is due to Anghel [A1, Theorem 2.1].

The seminal work on relative index theory is part of Gromov and Lawson's fundamental paper [GL] on metrics with positive scalar curvature. They prove a relative index theorem for Dirac operators on complete manifolds [GL, Theorem 4.18]. Anghel generalized this result to any essentially self–adjoint first order elliptic differential operator on a complete manifold [A1, Corollary 3.15]. However, the proofs of [GL, A1] do not use the heat equation and hence their index theorems are not local.

The local relative index theorem Theorem 3.6.1 is due to Donnelly [D1] for the signature operator. The generalization of Donnelly's method to arbitrary Dirac operators was carried out by Bunke [Bu1]. The present generalization which covers group actions and singularities in the interior, in particular conic singularities, is due to the author. As already mentioned in the summary, our exposition follows [D1] very closely.

## Chapter IV

# Deficiency Indices and Dirac–Schrödinger Operators

## Summary

If $D$ is a symmetric Chernoff operator like in the previous section then it is a priori not clear that $D$ has any self–adjoint extension at all. If the underlying manifold is complete then $D$ is essentially self–adjoint in view of Corollary 3.2.6. However, in the presence of singularities $D$ may have nontrivial *deficiency indices.*

From the functional analytic point of view the symmetric and self–adjoint extensions of $D$ are very well understood by von Neumann's theory of deficiency indices. Therefore it is a natural question whether it is possible to calculate the deficiency indices of Chernoff operators at least for a simple class of singularities.

If a symmetric operator, $D$, has certain invariance properties (e.g. equivariant with respect to a group action, equivariant with respect to a Clifford action) then it is natural to ask for self–adjoint extensions within the appropriate class of invariant operators.

Therefore, in Section 4.1 we generalize von Neumann's theory of deficiency indices to operators which are equivariant with respect to a compact group or with respect to a Clifford algebra. This leads to deficiency indices taking values in a character ring or in $KO^{-*}(\mathrm{pt})$. We content ourselves to operators with a finite dimensional defect space. In this case the operators $D^* \pm iI$ are Fredholm and the deficiency indices are Fredholm indices. It is this observation that lead us to construct "Clifford–deficiency" indices and hence our construction uses the Clifford index a la Atiyah–Bott–Shapiro [LM, Sec. III.10].

In Section 4.2 we discuss what we call the localization principle for deficiency indices. Let $D$ be a Chernoff operator on a manifold $M$, where $M$ is as in (3.2.1). Then roughly speaking, the deficiency indices are independent of the structure of $M$ at infinity. More precisely, the deficiency indices can be calculated in an arbitrary small neighborhood of the singularities of $M$. This means that deficiency indices are computable if we have a nice model for the singularities. As examples we then discuss first order Fuchs type operators on the model cone and first order operators of APS type on the model cylinder.

In Section 4.3 we put together the results of Sections 4.1 and 4.2 to calculate the various types of deficiency indices on complete manifolds with conic singularities. A consequence of our theory is a purely analytic proof of the $(Cl_k, \mathrm{G})$–Cobordism Theorem for Dirac operators. Moreover, we would like to emphasize that in our approach to the Cobordism Theorem it is not essential that the operator is of Dirac type. All we need is the Chernoff property and a certain typical form of the operator near the cone tip (cf. 2.1–2.3).

Another application of the Deficiency Index Theorem is an obstruction against metrics of positive scalar curvature (Theorem 4.3.6).

The basic idea for the proof of the Cobordism Theorem is very simple and therefore we single it out here. Let $D$ be a symmetric closed operator in some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with finite deficiency indices. Then, $D + i\lambda I$ is Fredholm for $\lambda \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$\operatorname{ind}(D + i\lambda I) = \begin{cases} -n_+(D), & \lambda > 0, \\ -n_-(D), & \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

All we need to conclude that $n_+(D) = n_-(D)$ is the Fredholmness of $D$. Namely, if $D$ is a Fredholm operator then

$$D + i\lambda I, \quad -1 \le \lambda \le 1$$

is a continuous family of Fredholm operators and the stability of the Fredholm index implies $n_+(D) = n_-(D)$. Now, the Deficiency Index Theorems 4.3.2, 4.3.5 interprete the Fredholm index of a certain Chernoff operator, $A$, as the difference of the deficiency indices of another operator, $D$. Furthermore, $D$ is Fredholm if $A$ is cobordant to 0. Hence the deficiency indices of $D$ coincide and thus the index of $A$ vanishes.

We have sketched here the complex case. This has to be refined for $Cl_k$–linear operators.

In Section 4.4 we discuss Dirac–Schrödinger operators. Dirac–Schrödinger operators are symmetric Chernoff operators with a skew–adjoint potential. These operators turn out to have an interesting Fredholm index. The context of singular manifolds allows us to present the index theory of Dirac–Schrödinger operators and the theory of deficiency indices in a unified way. Namely, the operator $D \pm iI$, whose indices are the deficiency indices of $D$, is a typical example of a Dirac–Schrödinger operator.

Finally we should mention that the term "Dirac–Schrödinger operator" is not the only one that can be found in the literature. The first index theorem for such operators was published by Callias [Ca1] and hence the term "Callias operator" occurs quite frequently in the literature [A2, Bu2, Ra].

Nowadays the term Dirac–Schrödinger operator seems to become standard [BM] and following the suggestion of one of the referees we prefer the latter to address these operators.

## 4.1 Deficiency Indices of Equivariant Operators

First of all we recall the basic facts about deficiency indices. Given a densely defined symmetric operator, $P : \mathcal{D}(P) \to \mathcal{H}$, in the complex HILBERT space $\mathcal{H}$, we denote by $P_{\min}$ its closure and put $P_{\max} := P^* \supset P_{\min}$. We equip $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ with the *graph scalar product*

$$(x|y)_P := (x|y) + (P_{\max}x|P_{\max}y). \tag{1.1}$$

Furthermore, we introduce the hermitian sesquilinear form

$$q_P(x, y) := -i((P_{\max}x|y) - (x|P_{\max}y)), \quad x, y \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max}). \tag{1.2}$$

We note explicitly that in this book scalar products are linear in the first and antilinear in the second argument.

The following result is well–known (cf. [DS, Sec. XII.4.7]). However, since it will be crucial for the rest of this chapter we include a proof for the convenience of the reader.

**Proposition 4.1.1** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex* HILBERT *space and $P$ a densely defined symmetric closed operator in $\mathcal{H}$.*

$$E_\pm(P) := \ker(P_{\max} \mp i\,I), \quad E(P) := E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P),$$

*are closed subspaces of $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ and we have an orthogonal decomposition*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) = \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P), \tag{1.3}$$

*where the sum is orthogonal with respect to the graph scalar product* (1.1).

*We write the domain of an extension, $P_{\min} \subset \widetilde{P} \subset P_{\max}$ in the form*

$$\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{P}) = \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus V$$

*with a subspace $V \subset E(P)$. Then we have the following characterization of symmetric and self–adjoint extensions of $P_{\min}$:*

(i) *$\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus V$ is the domain of a symmetric extension of $P_{\min}$ if and only if there is a subspace $W \subset E_+(P)$ and an isometry $\Phi$ from $W$ into $E_-(P)$ such that*

$$V = \{x + \Phi x \,|\, x \in W\}. \tag{1.4}$$

(ii) *$\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus V$ is the domain of a self–adjoint extension of $P_{\min}$ if and only if there is a unitary map $\Phi$ from $E_+(P)$ onto $E_-(P)$ such that*

$$V = \{x + \Phi x \,|\, x \in E_+(P)\}.$$

**Remark** The numbers

$$n_\pm(P) := \dim E_\pm(P) \in \mathbf{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$$

are called the *deficiency indices* of $P$. They reveal the existence of self–adjoint extensions of $P$: $P$ has self–adjoint extensions if and only if $n_+(P) = n_-(P)$ and there is a 1-1 correspondence between self–adjoint extensions and unitaries $E_+ \to E_-$.

**Proof** First, we show that $E(P)$ is orthogonal to $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ with respect to the graph scalar product. We pick $x \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ and $y \in E_{\pm}(P)$, $P_{\max} y = \varepsilon y, \varepsilon \in \{\pm i\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(x|y)_P &= (x|y) + (P_{\min} x | P_{\max} y)\\ &= (x|y) + \bar{\varepsilon}(P_{\min} x | y)\\ &= (x|y) + \bar{\varepsilon}(x | P_{\max} y)\\ &= (x|y) + \bar{\varepsilon}^2 (x|y) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ is a closed subspace of the HILBERT space $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$, where both spaces are equipped with the graph scalar product. We let

$$\overline{E}(P) := \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})^{\perp}$$

be the orthogonal complement, such that

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) = \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus \overline{E}(P).$$

We already proved $E(P) \subset \overline{E}(P)$. To prove the reverse inclusion pick $x \in \overline{E}(P)$. Then we have for all $y \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$

$$0 = (x|y)_P = (x|y) + (P_{\max} x | P_{\min} y).$$

By definition of the adjoint this implies $P_{\max} x \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ and

$$P_{\max}^2 x = -x.$$

Moreover $P_{\max} x \in \overline{E}(P)$ since for all $y \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$

$$\begin{aligned}(P_{\max} x | y)_P &= (P_{\max} x | y) + (P_{\max}^2 x | P_{\max} y)\\ &= (x | P_{\min} y) - (x | P_{\min} y) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have for $x, y \in \overline{E}(P)$

$$\begin{aligned}(x|y)_P &= (x|y) + (P_{\max} x | P_{\max} y)\\ &= (P_{\max}^2 x | P_{\max}^2 y) + (P_{\max} x | P_{\max} y)\\ &= (P_{\max} x | P_{\max} y)_P.\end{aligned}$$

Summing up we have proved that $P_{\max}$ maps $\overline{E}(P)$ isometrically into itself and its square equals $-1$. Thus $\overline{E}(P)$ splits into the orthogonal sum of the $\pm i$–eigenspaces of $P_{\max}|\overline{E}(P)$ which proves $\overline{E}(P) \subset E(P)$.

The hermitian sesquilinear form $q_D$ is positive definite on $E_+(P)$ and negative definite on $E_-(P)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) + V$ is the domain of a symmetric extension of $P_{\min}$ if and only if $q_D(x, y) = 0$ for $x, y \in V$. It is the domain of a self–adjoint extension if and only if

$$\{x \in E(P) \,|\, q_P(x, y) = 0 \text{ for all } y \in V\} = V.$$

From these observations (i) and (ii) easily follow. □

If the deficiency indices are finite then they can be interpreted as Fredholm indices, because we have the following

**Note 4.1.2** *If* $n_\pm(P) < \infty$ *then* $P_{\min} + \lambda i I$ *is a* Fredholm *operator for* $\lambda \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$ *and*

$$\operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} + \lambda i I) = \begin{cases} -n_+(P), & \lambda > 0, \\ -n_-(P), & \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

*If* $P_{\min}$ *itself is a* Fredholm *operator then* $n_+(P) = n_-(P) = -\operatorname{ind}(P_{\min})$.

*To check the* Fredholm *property of* $P_{\min}$ *it suffices to show that* $\dim\ker\, P_{\min} < \infty$ *and that* $P_{\min}$ *has closed range.*

**Proof** Most of the statements are obvious. We prove the last assertion. Thus assume that $\dim\ker\, P_{\min} < \infty$ and that $P_{\min}$ has closed range. We have to show

$$\dim\ker\, P_{\max} < \infty.$$

If $x = x_0 + \xi \in \ker\, P_{\max}$, with $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}), \xi \in E(P) = E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P)$, we find, since $P_{\max}$ maps $E(P)$ unitarily into itself,

$$x_0 \in P_{\min}^{-1}(E(P)),$$

thus

$$\dim\ker\, P_{\max} \leq \dim E(P) + \dim\ker\, P_{\min} < \infty.$$

Now $(P_{\min} + \lambda i I)_{-1 \leq \lambda \leq 1}$ is a continuous family of Fredholm operators $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$. By the stability of the Fredholm index we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind} P_{\min} &= \operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} + i) = -n_+(P) \\ &= \operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} - i) = -n_-(P). \end{aligned}$$

□

We already noted in Section 2.4 that the Fredholm property of $P_{\min}$ implies the equality of the deficiency indices.

For later purposes, we need a characterization of the deficiency indices which is independent of the orthogonal decomposition (1.3) and which only uses the space $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$.

The hermitian sesquilinear form $q_P$ defined in (1.2) satisfies $q_P(x, y) = 0$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ or $y \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$. Hence, $q_P$ induces a hermitian sesquilinear form on $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$, which we also denote by $q_P$. Obviously, the following holds

**Note 4.1.3** $q_P$ *is non–degenerate on* $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ *and if this space is finite dimensional then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} n_+(P) &= \operatorname{index}(q_P), \\ \dim(\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})) &= \operatorname{rank}(q_P), \\ n_-(P) &= \operatorname{rank}(q_P) - \operatorname{index}(q_P). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** From the orthogonal decomposition (1.3) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} q_P(x, x) &= \pm \|x\|_P^2, \quad x \in E_\pm(P), \\ q_P(x, y) &= 0, \quad x \in E_+(P),\ y \in E_-(P) \end{aligned}$$

and we reach the conclusion.

□

The aim of this section is to generalize these considerations to operators which are equivariant with respect to a compact group or with respect to a Clifford algebra.

In the sequel we will always consider operators with **finite** deficiency indices.

### 4.1.1 G–Equivariant Symmetric Operators

Let $G$ be a compact group acting unitarily on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, let $P$ be a $G$–equivariant symmetric operator, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &G \subset \mathcal{UL}(\mathcal{H}), \\ &gP = Pg \quad \text{for} \quad g \in G. \end{aligned}$$

The last equation in particular means $g\mathcal{D}(P) = \mathcal{D}(P)$ and $Pgx = gPx$ for $x \in \mathcal{D}(P)$. It easily implies $gP_{\min} = P_{\min}g$. Next let $x \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ and $g \in G$. Then we have for all $z \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$

$$(gx|P_{\min}z) = (x|g^{-1}P_{\min}z) = (x|P_{\min}g^{-1}z) = (P_{\max}x|g^{-1}z) = (gP_{\max}x|z), \tag{1.5}$$

thus $gx \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ and $gP_{\max}x = P_{\max}gx$. Consequently, $G$ also acts unitarily on $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ and the $E_\pm(P)$ are *finite dimensional representation spaces of* $G$.

**Definition 4.1.4** *The $G$–deficiency indices, $n_\pm(P,G)$, of $P$ are defined to be the equivalence classes of the finite dimensional $G$–module $E_\pm(P)$ in the character ring $R(G)$, i. e. $n_\pm(P,G) := \chi_{E_\pm(P)}$. $\chi_{E_\pm(P)}$ is defined via*

$$\chi_{E_\pm(P)}(g) = \operatorname{tr}(g|E_\pm(P)) =: n_\pm(P,g), \quad g \in G.$$

For the discussion of $R(G)$ we refer to [BD, Sec. II.7].

**Lemma 4.1.5** 1. *$P$ has $G$–equivariant self–adjoint extensions if and only if $n_+(P,G) = n_-(P,G)$. In this case, there is a 1-1 correspondence between $G$–equivariant self–adjoint extensions and unitary $G$–module isomorphisms $E_+(P) \to E_-(P)$. If $\Phi : E_+(P) \to E_-(P)$ is a $G$–module isomorphism then the domain of the corresponding $G$–equivariant self–adjoint extension is*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus \{x + \Phi x \,|\, x \in E_+(P)\}.$$

2. *$P_{\min} + \lambda i I$ is a $G$–Fredholm operator for $\lambda \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and*

$$\operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} + \lambda i I, G) = \begin{cases} -n_+(P,G), & \lambda > 0, \\ -n_-(P,G), & \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

*If $P_{\min}$ itself is a Fredholm operator then $n_+(P,G) = n_-(P,G) = -\operatorname{ind}(P_{\min},G)$.*

The proof of this lemma is completely analogous to the proof's of Proposition 4.1.1 and Note 4.1.2.

In order to obtain the the analogue of Note 4.1.3, we consider pairs, $(V,q)$, consisting of a finite dimensional representation space, $V$, of $G$ and a non–degenerate hermitian $G$–invariant sesquilinear form $q$. To $(V,q)$ we assign an element of $R(G)$ as follows:

we choose a hermitian $G$–invariant scalar product on $V$. Then there is a hermitian invertible $G$–endomorphism, $A : V \to V$, such that

$$q(x, y) = (Ax|y).$$

If $V^{\pm}$ denotes the positive (negative) spectral subspace of $A$, then

$$V = V^+ \oplus V^- \tag{1.6}$$

is a $G$–invariant decomposition, such that $q|V^+$ is positive definite and $q|V^-$ is negative definite. We put

$$\Phi(V, q) := [V^+] - [V^-] \in R(G).$$

From (1.6) we infer in particular that, in case of irreducibility of $V$, $q$ is positive or negative definite. This also yields a proof of the fact that $\Phi$ is well–defined. Namely, if

$$V = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_r \oplus V_{r+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus V_{r+s} \tag{1.7}$$

is the decomposition into irreducible $G$–modules, such that

$$q|V_j \begin{cases} > 0, & j \le r, \\ < 0, & j \ge r+1, \end{cases}$$

we obtain immediately

$$\Phi(V, q) = [V_1] + \cdots + [V_r] - [V_{r+1}] - \cdots - [V_{r+s}].$$

Thus we have proved.

**Lemma 4.1.6** *If one decomposes* $(\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}), q)$ *according to* (1.7)*, then*

$$\begin{aligned} n_+(P, G) &= [V_1] + \cdots + [V_r], \\ n_-(P, G) &= [V_{r+1}] + \cdots + [V_{r+s}], \\ \Phi(\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}), q) &= n_+(P, G) - n_-(P, G). \end{aligned}$$

### 4.1.2 Deficiency Indices of $Cl_k$–linear Real Operators

In this subsection we investigate the functional analytic properties of symmetric and antisymmetric operators which are $Cl_k$–linear. $Cl_k$ is the real Clifford algebra, for which we refer to [LM, Chap. 1]. Likewise, we will not reproduce the index theory of $Cl_k$–linear Fredholm operators in this book. We use it in the terminology of [LM, Sec. III.10]. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a $\mathbf{Z}_2$–graded real Hilbert space. We assume that the Clifford algebra $Cl_k$ is represented (as a $C^*$–algebra) on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. We may think of $Cl_k$ as the universal $C^*$–algebra generated by unitary elements $e_1, \cdots, e_k$ subject to the relations

$$e_i e_j + e_j e_i = -2\delta_{ij}. \tag{1.8}$$

Now we replace $k$ by $k+1$ and consider a densely defined, symmetric, odd, $Cl_{k+1}$–linear operator

$$P : \mathcal{D}(P) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}. \tag{1.9}$$

$Cl_{k+1}$–linear means that $P$ commutes with the elements of $Cl_{k+1}$. In particular, the domain of $P$ is invariant under the $e_j$. First, we are interested in the question whether $P$ has self–adjoint $Cl_{k+1}$–linear extensions or what are the obstructions against this. According to [LM, Remark III.10.9], we can get rid of the grading:

**Definition 4.1.7** *Let $\alpha$ be the grading automorphism of the Clifford algebra, i. e. $\alpha(e_j) = -e_j$. An antisymmetric operator, $P$, in $\mathcal{H}$ will be called $Cl_k$–antilinear, if the elements of $Cl_k$ map the domain of $P$ into itself and $P\xi = \alpha(\xi)P$ for $\xi \in Cl_k$.*

**Proposition 4.1.8** *Let $P$ be symmetric and $Cl_{k+1}$–linear. Moreover let*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & P^1 \\ P^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

*be the representation of $P$ with respect to the decomposition of the* HILBERT *space $\mathcal{H}$ induced by $\alpha$. If one identifies $Cl_k$ with $Cl^0_{k+1}$ (see below) in the usual way, then the operator $e_1P^0$ is antisymmetric and $Cl_k$–antilinear. $P$ has self–adjoint odd $Cl_{k+1}$–linear extensions if and only if $e_1P^0$ has skew–adjoint $Cl_k$–antilinear extensions.*

**Proof** The identification of $Cl_k$ with $Cl^0_{k+1}$ is obtained by choosing the elements

$$f_j := e_{j+1}e_1, \quad j = 1, \cdots, k$$

as generators of $Cl_k$. These obviously satisfy the defining relations (1.8). It is clear that $e_1P^0$ is antisymmetric. Moreover,

$$f_je_1P^0 = e_{j+1}e_1e_1P^0 = -e_1e_{j+1}e_1P^0 = -e_1P^0f_j, \quad j \geq 1,$$

thus $e_1P^0$ is $Cl_k$–antilinear.

Now if $\overline{P}$ is a self–adjoint odd $Cl_{k+1}$–linear extension of $P$ then the same calculation shows that $e_1\overline{P}^0$ is skew–adjoint and $Cl_k$–antilinear.

Conversely, let $D$ be a $Cl_k$–antilinear skew–adjoint extension of $e_1P^0$. Then

$$\overline{P} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -De_1 \\ -e_1D & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a self–adjoint odd $Cl_{k+1}$–linear extension of $P$ and we are done. □

Thus, in case $k \geq 0$ we are reduced to the consideration of ungraded antisymmetric $Cl_k$–antilinear operators. In case $k = -1$ we just have to deal with an odd symmetric operator, which always has odd self–adjoint extensions (cf. (3.4.1)).

Thus let $P$ be antisymmetric and $Cl_k$–antilinear. Similar to the beginning of this section we put

$$P_{\max} := -P^*. \tag{1.10}$$

$P_{\max}$ is an extension of $P_{\min}$ and analogous to Proposition 4.1.1 one proves the orthogonal decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(P_{\max}) &= \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P), \\ E_\pm(P) &:= \ker(P_{\max} \mp I). \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

We put

$$E(P) := E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P) \tag{1.12}$$

and *assume from now on* that $E(P)$ is **finite dimensional**.

**Lemma 4.1.9** *$E(P)$ is a $\mathbf{Z}_2$–graded $Cl_k$–module. Here, the grading is given by the decomposition $E(P) := E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P)$.*

**Proof** Analogous to (1.5) we see that $P_{\max}$ as well as $P_{\min}$ are $Cl_k$–antilinear. Consequently, $Cl_k$ is represented on $\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})$ (as a $C^*$–algebra), and $\mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$ is a $Cl_k$–invariant subspace. Then the orthogonal complement, $E(P)$, is invariant, too. Since $P_{\max}$ also is $Cl_k$–antilinear, we get immediately that the odd Clifford elements map $E_\pm \to E_\mp$ and the even Clifford–elements map $E_\pm \to E_\pm$. □

Following ATIYAH–BOTT–SHAPIRO (cf. [ABS], [LM, Sec. I.9]), let $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k$ be the GROTHENDIECK group of equivalence classes of finite dimensional $\mathbf{Z}_2$–graded $Cl_k$–modules. Then there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k/\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1} \cong KO^{-k}(pt), \tag{1.13}$$

where $KO$ denotes the K–theory of real vector bundles (cf. [LM, Sec. I.9]) If $\mathcal{M}_k$ is defined analogously for ungraded modules, one has the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}_{k-1}/\mathcal{M}_k \cong \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k/\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}. \tag{1.14}$$

**Definition 4.1.10** *The deficiency index*

$$\text{def-ind}_k(P) \in KO^{-k}(pt) \cong \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k/\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{k+1}$$

*of the operator $P$ is defined to be the equivalence class of the module $E(P)$.*

**Theorem 4.1.11** *The antisymmetric $Cl_k$–antilinear operator $P$ has a skew–adjoint $Cl_k$–antilinear extension if and only if* def-ind$_k(P) = 0$.

*In this case, there is a 1-1 correspondence between skew–adjoint $Cl_k$–antilinear extensions and unitary isomorphisms $U : E_+(P) \to E_-(P)$ satisfying*

$$e_j U = U^* e_j | E_+. \tag{1.15}$$

*The domain of the corresponding extension is*

$$\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus \{x + Ux \,|\, x \in E_+(P)\}.$$

**Proof** Let $\overline{P}$ be such an extension. This means

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{P}) = \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus \{x + Ux \,|\, x \in E_+\}$$

with an isometry $U : E_+ \to E_-$. In addition,

$$V_{\overline{P}} := \{x + Ux \,|\, x \in E_+\}$$

is $Cl_k$–invariant. Now, (1.15) can easily be checked. Putting

$$e_0 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -U^* \\ U & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

this induces a graded $Cl_{k+1}$–module structure on $E(P)$, thus def-ind$P = 0$. The conclusions can be reversed. □

Next we give an interpretation of def-ind as a FREDHOLM index. Since the case $k = 0$ is completely analogous to the ordinary complex case, we may assume that $k \geq 1$. The proof of Theorem 4.1.11 shows that $P$ at least has a skew–adjoint $Cl_{k-1}$–antilinear extension $\overline{P}$. It is defined on

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{P}) := \mathcal{D}(P_{\min}) \oplus W, \quad W := \{x + e_1 x \,|\, x \in E_+(P)\} \tag{1.16}$$

and it is easy to check that $W$ is invariant under $e_2, \cdots, e_k$. Now we consider the operator

$$\overline{P} + \lambda e_1, \quad \lambda \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{1.17}$$

which is skew–adjoint and $Cl_{k-1}$–antilinear with respect to the Clifford algebra generated by $e_2, \cdots, e_k$.

**Lemma 4.1.12** 1. *Let $T$ be an antisymmetric closed operator with closed range, $\dim \ker T < \infty$, $\dim E(T) < \infty$. Then $T$ is* FREDHOLM *and $\operatorname{ind}(T) = -\frac{1}{2}\dim E(T)$.*

2. *If $\lambda \neq 0$, the operator $P_{\min} + \lambda e_1$ is injective with closed range and* FREDHOLM. *Furthermore,*

$$\ker (P_{\max} \pm e_1) \subset E(P).$$

**Proof** 1. is shown like Note 4.1.2.

2. The first assertion follows immediately from the identity

$$\|(P_{\min} + \lambda e_1)x\|^2 = \|P_{\min}x\|^2 + \lambda^2\|x\|^2, \quad x \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$$

and part 1. For proving the rest of the statement we compute for $x \in \ker (P_{\max} \pm e_1)$, $y \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})$

$$\begin{aligned} (x|y)_P &= (x|y) + (P_{\max}x|P_{\min}y) = (x|y) \mp (e_1x|P_{\min}y) \\ &= (e_1x|e_1y) \pm (P_{\max}x|e_1y) = ((P_{\max} \pm e_1)x|e_1y) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

thus $x \in \mathcal{D}(P_{\min})^\perp = E(P)$. □

From this Lemma we immediately obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ker (P_{\max} + e_1) &= \{x + e_1x \,|\, x \in E_+(P)\}, \\ \ker (P_{\max} - e_1) &= \{x - e_1x \,|\, x \in E_+(P)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\ker (\overline{P} + e_1) = W, \quad \ker (\overline{P} - e_1) = \{0\}. \tag{1.18}$$

Now, we recall the Definition of the $Cl_k$–FREDHOLM index (cf. [LM, Sec. III.10]). Given a skew–adjoint $Cl_k$–antilinear FREDHOLM operator $T$. Then ker $T$ is a finite dimensional $Cl_k$–module, which in view of (1.14) defines an equivalence class $\operatorname{ind}_{k+1}T := [\ker T] \in KO^{-k-1}(pt)$. This index has the same stability properties as the ordinary FREDHOLM index. In particular it is a homotopy invariant. Furthermore, we note that the isomorphism (1.14) is obtained by assigning to a graded $Cl_{k+1}$–module $V$ the (ungraded) $Cl^0_{k+1} \cong Cl_k$–module $V_+$ [LM, Prop. I.5.20].

**Lemma 4.1.13** *$E_+(T)$ and $W$ are canonical isomorphic as $Cl_{k-1}$–modules.*

**Proof** Note first, that the Clifford algebra generated by $e_2e_1, e_3e_1, \cdots, e_ke_1$ acts on $E_+(T)$ and the Clifford algebra generated by $e_2, \cdots, e_k$ acts on $W$. Then the isomorphism is given by

$$E_+ \to W, \quad x \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x + e_1x). \qquad \square$$

Summing up we have proved:

**Theorem 4.1.14** *Let $P$ be an antisymmetric $Cl_k$–antilinear operator with* $\dim E(P) < \infty$*, $k \geq 1$. Let $\overline{P}$ be the operator defined in* (1.16).

1. *For $\lambda \neq 0$, the operator $\overline{P} + \lambda e_1$ is a skew–adjoint $Cl_{k-1}$–antilinear* FREDHOLM *operator. Furthermore, we have*

$$\operatorname{ind}_k(\overline{P} + \lambda e_1) = \begin{cases} \text{def-ind}_k(P), & \lambda > 0, \\ 0, & \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

2. *If $P_{\min}$ itself is* FREDHOLM *then* $\text{def-ind}_k(P) = 0$.

Just for completeness, we note the case $k = 0$ which corresponds to Note 4.1.2.

**Theorem 4.1.15** *Let $P$ be as above and $k = 0$. Then, for $\lambda \neq 0$, $P_{\min} + \lambda I$ is a* FREDHOLM *operator and*

$$\operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} + \lambda I) = \begin{cases} -\dim E_+(P), & \lambda > 0, \\ -\dim E_-(P), & \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

*In particular*

$$\text{def-ind}_0(P) = \operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} - I) - \operatorname{ind}(P_{\min} + I).$$

*If $P_{\min}$ itself is* FREDHOLM *then* $\text{def-ind}_0(P) = 0$.

We briefly discuss the interesting cases according to the classification of Clifford algebras. This will also give an interpretation of deficiency indices independent of the scalar product. This is the analogue of Note 4.1.3 and Lemma 4.1.6. We write $k = 8m + l, l \in \{0, \cdots, 7\}$ and note that

$$Cl_{8m+l} \cong Cl_{8m} \otimes Cl_l.$$

Here the tensor product is to be understood in the ungraded sense and $Cl_{8m+l}$ inherits the grading from $Cl_l$ (cf. [LM, Sec. I.4]). Since $Cl_{8m}$ is finite dimensional, $\mathcal{H}$ has an isometric representation

$$\mathcal{H} = V \otimes \mathcal{H}_1 \tag{1.19}$$

with the irreducible $Cl_{8m}$–module $V$ and a HILBERT space $\mathcal{H}_1$ on which $Cl_l$ acts (Using the Clifford group, this follows easily from the theorem of Peter–Weyl (cf. [R2, 2.15ff])). Since $Cl_{8m+l}$ inherits the grading from $Cl_l$, $P$ commutes with elements of the form $x \otimes 1, x \in Cl_{8m}$. Since $V$ is irreducible over $Cl_{8m}$, $P$ has the form

$$P = I \otimes Q \tag{1.20}$$

with an antisymmetric $Cl_l$–antilinear operator $Q$. Now we deal with the interesting cases $l = 0, 1, 2, 4$ separately.

$l = 0:$ is Theorem 4.1.15.

$l = 1:$ $E(Q)$ is a graded $Cl_1$–module. Thus $E_+(Q)$ is just a real vector space. This is a $Cl_1 = \mathbf{C}$–vector space if and only if its dimension is even, thus

$$\text{def-ind}_1(Q) = \dim_{\mathbf{R}} E_+(Q) \bmod 2 = \frac{1}{2}\dim_{\mathbf{R}} E(Q) \bmod 2. \tag{1.21}$$

$l = 2:$ $E(Q)$ is a graded $Cl_2$–module, consequently $E_+(Q)$ is a $Cl_1 = \mathbf{C}$–vector space. This is a $Cl_2 = \mathbf{H}$–vector space if and only if its complex dimension is even. Consequently

$$\text{def-ind}_2(Q) = \dim_{\mathbf{C}} E_+(Q) \bmod 2 = \frac{1}{4}\dim_{\mathbf{R}} E(Q) \bmod 2. \tag{1.22}$$

$l = 4:$ In this case we make another reduction. Analogous to (1.19) we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = W \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$$

with an irreducible $Cl_4$–module $W$. If $\omega \in Cl_4$ is the volume element then the operator $\omega Q$ is $Cl_4$–linear. Thus like (1.20)

$$\omega Q = I \otimes R \tag{1.23}$$

and

$$Q = \omega \otimes R \tag{1.24}$$

with an antisymmetric operator $R$. Now one easily checks

$$\text{def-ind}_4(Q) = \text{def-ind}_0(R). \tag{1.25}$$

We note again that the right hand sides of (1.21), (1.22), (1.25) are invariants of the hermitian sesquilinear form $q_P$ on $(\mathcal{D}(P_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(P_{\min}), q_p)$.

## 4.2 Localization of the Deficiency Index

The considerations of the preceding section easily yield a localization principle for deficiency indices of Chernoff operators. We consider again the situation (3.2.1) and a symmetric Chernoff operator, $D_0$, on $M$. We wish to treat the situations of Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 simultaneously as far as possible and assume that $D_0$ is equivariant in the sense of one of these sections. In the case of $G$–equivariance, this also includes the $G$–invariance of $U$. Let $D_0 \subset D \subset D_{0,\max}$ be a symmetric equivariant extension. In particular we have $D \subset D_{\max} \subset D_{0,\max}$. We consider the spaces $\mathcal{KD}(D, U)$ and $\mathcal{KD}(D_{\max}, U)$ (cf. (1.4.2)). By Proposition 3.2.5 we always have $(1-\varphi)s \in \mathcal{D}(D_{0,\min})$ for $s \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max/\min})$ and $\varphi \in C_U^\infty(M)$ with $\varphi|U \equiv 1$. Thus $\varphi s \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max/\min})$. Consequently, the assumption stated before (1.4.2) is satisfied automatically. From these considerations one easily concludes (cf. [L1, Sec. 2] for details):

**Theorem 4.2.1** *The natural inclusion* $\alpha : \mathcal{KD}(D_{\max}, U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$ *induces an equivariant isomorphism*

$$\overline{\alpha} : (\mathcal{KD}(D_{\max}, U)/\mathcal{KD}(D_{\min}, U), q_D) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{D}(D_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(D_{\min}), q_D).$$

In view of Lemma 4.1.6 and the considerations at the end of Section 4.1, this shows that the deficiency indices only depend on $D$ restricted to $U$, i. e. they do not depend on the "complete part" $M \setminus U$.

**Corollary 4.2.2** *Let* $D_1, D_2$ *be Chernoff operators on* $M_1, M_2$ *which coincide over* $U_1, U_2$ *in the sense of Definition* 1.4.10. *Assume that* $D_1, D_2$ *are equivariant, either with respect to a compact group (cf. Sec.* 4.1.1*) or with respect to a Clifford action (cf. Sec.* 4.1.2*). Then their deficiency indices coincide.*

Furthermore, we remark that the condition $\varphi\mathcal{D}(D_1) = \varphi\mathcal{D}(D_2)$ for $\varphi \in C_W^\infty(U)$, $\varphi|W \equiv 1$ is stable under taking closures. In particular, it holds for $D_{1,\max/\min}, D_{2,\max/\min}$, if only $D_1|C_0^\infty(E|U) = D_2|C_0^\infty(E|U)$.

Namely, if $s \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{D}_1)$, then there exists $(s_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(D_1)$, $s_n \to s, D_1 s_n \to D_1 s$. Consequently, $\varphi s_n \in \varphi\mathcal{D}(D_1) = \varphi\mathcal{D}(D_2), \varphi s_n \to \varphi s$ and

$$D_2(\varphi s_n) = D_1(\varphi s_n) = \sigma_{D_1}(d\varphi)(s_n) + \varphi D_1 s_n.$$

Since supp $d\varphi$ is compact this converges and hence $\varphi s \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{D}_2)$. But then we also have $\varphi s \in \varphi\mathcal{D}(\overline{D}_2)$.

### 4.2.1 $G$–Equivariant Operators on the Model Cone $N^\wedge$

Let

$$A : C_0^\infty(E) \longrightarrow C_0^\infty(E) \tag{2.1}$$

be a first order symmetric elliptic differential operator acting between sections of the hermitian vector bundle $E \to N$. We assume $A$ to be equivariant with respect to a compact group $G$ (cf. p. 97/97). Moreover, let $\Gamma$ be a unitary bundle endomorphism $E \to E$ satisfying

$$\Gamma^2 = -I, \quad \Gamma A = -A\Gamma. \tag{2.2}$$

We consider

$$D := \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + A) : C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C_0^\infty(E)) \longrightarrow C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C_0^\infty(E)). \tag{2.3}$$

We note that DIRAC operators on the metric cylinder $\mathbf{R}_+ \times N$ are of this form. For those operators, $\Gamma$ is Clifford multiplication by the inward normal vector.

**Definition 4.2.3** *For* $\lambda > 0$ *let*

$$\mathcal{D}(D^\lambda) := \{f \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C_0^\infty(E)) \,|\, 1_{[\lambda,\infty)}(A)(f(0)) = 0\}$$

*and*

$$\mathcal{D}(D^0) := \{f \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, C_0^\infty(E)) \,|\, 1_{(0,\infty)}(A)(f(0)) = 0\}.$$

For the definition of $1_{[\lambda,\infty)}$ see p. 44.

**Lemma 4.2.4** *$D^\lambda$ is symmetric and*

$$(\mathcal{D}(D^\lambda_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(D^\lambda_{\min}), q_D) \cong (V^\lambda, q),$$

*where*

$$V^\lambda = \begin{cases} \operatorname{im} 1_{(-\lambda,\lambda)}(A), & \lambda > 0, \\ \ker A, & \lambda = 0, \end{cases}$$

*and*

$$q(x,y) = i(\Gamma x|y), \quad x, y \in V^\lambda.$$

**Proof** We proceed analogously to the proof of [L1, Prop. 4.1]. Put

$$W_\mu(A) := \ker(A^2 - \mu^2 I), \quad \mu \geq 0.$$

Then

$$L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, L^2(E)) = \bigoplus_{\mu \geq 0} L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, W_\mu(A))$$

is a $G$–equivariant decomposition which reduces $D^\lambda$. For the proof that

$$D^\lambda | L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, W_\mu(A))$$

is essentially self–adjoint for $\mu \geq \lambda$, we may ignore the $G$–action. For $\mu \geq \lambda$ we now choose an orthonormal basis $(\phi_n)_{n=1,\cdots,N}$ of $\ker(A - \mu I)$. Then $(\Gamma\phi_n)$ is an orthonormal basis of $\ker(A + \mu I)$ and hence

$$W_\mu(A) = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{N} \operatorname{span}(\phi_n, \Gamma\phi_n).$$

On $L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, \operatorname{span}(\phi_n, \Gamma\phi_n))$, $D^\lambda$ has the form

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 \\ 0 & -\mu \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

with domain

$$\mathcal{D}(T) = \{(f_1, f_2) \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, \mathbf{C}^2) \mid f_1(0) = 0\}.$$

Integration by parts now immediately shows that $T$ is essentially self–adjoint and

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{T}) = \{(f_1, f_2) \in H^1(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, \mathbf{C}^2) \mid f_1(0) = 0\}.$$

Let $T_\mu := D^\lambda | L^2(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, W_\mu(A))$ for $\mu < \lambda$. Then

$$\mathcal{D}(T_{\mu,\max}) = H^1(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, \mathbf{C}^2)$$

and integration by parts shows that

$$\mathcal{D}(T_{\mu,\max}) \longrightarrow W_\mu(A), \quad f \mapsto f(0)$$

induces an isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{D}(T_{\mu,\max})/\mathcal{D}(T_{\mu,\min}), q_{T_\mu}) \longrightarrow (W_\mu(A), q)$$

with $q(x,y) = i(\Gamma x|y)$. From this the assertion follows. □

**Corollary 4.2.5** (cf. [L1, Prop. 4.1]) *The deficiency indices of $D^\lambda$ are finite and*

$$n_\pm(D,G) = [\ker(\Gamma \pm i) \cap \ker A] + \sum_{0<\mu<\lambda} [\ker(A-\mu I)] \in R(G).$$

**Proof** Using the notations of the preceding proof,

$$V^\lambda = \ker A \oplus \sum_{0<\mu<\lambda} W_\mu(A)$$

is an orthogonal decomposition into $G$–modules which is also $q$–orthogonal. Obviously, $q$ is positive definite on $\ker(\Gamma+i)$ and negative definite on $\ker(\Gamma-i)$. Consequently,

$$n_\pm(D,G) = [\ker(\Gamma \pm i) \cap \ker A] + \sum_{0<\mu<\lambda} [\ker(\Gamma \pm i) \cap W_\mu(A)].$$

Let $U := \mu^{-1}(A|W_\mu(A))$. Then $U$ is a self–adjoint isometry and the map

$$\Phi : \ker(\Gamma \pm i) \cap W_\mu(A) \to \ker(A-\mu I),\ x \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x+Ux)$$

is an isomorphism of $G$–modules. □

Now we turn back to FUCHS type operators. Let $D \in \mathrm{Diff}_c^{1,1}(N^\wedge, E)$ be of the form

$$D = \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{x}A) \tag{2.4}$$

with $\Gamma, A$ as in (2.1), (2.2). DIRAC operators on the model cone $N^\wedge$ with metric $g = dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N$ are of this form [L1, Sec. 5]. By Proposition 1.3.11 and Proposition 3.2.5, $f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$ has the form

$$f(x) = \sum_{|\lambda|<\frac{1}{2}} \varphi(x) x^{-\lambda} f_\lambda + g$$

where $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}), \varphi \equiv 1$ near 0, $g \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$ and $f_\lambda \in \ker(A-\lambda I)$.

**Lemma 4.2.6** *The map*

$$\Phi : f \mapsto \sum_{|\lambda|<\frac{1}{2}} f_\lambda$$

*induces an isomorphism*

$$(\mathcal{D}(D_{\max})/\mathcal{D}(D_{\min}), q_D) \longrightarrow (V^{\frac{1}{2}}, q)$$

*where $q$ and $V^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are defined in Lemma* 4.2.4.

**Proof** We already know that $\Phi$ is an isomorphism of vector spaces. It remains to investigate how $q_D$ transforms under $\Phi$. If $f_1 \in \ker(A-\lambda I), f_2 \in \ker(A-\mu I)$, then

$$(D\varphi X^{-\lambda} f_1 | \varphi X^{-\mu} f_2) = \int_0^\infty \varphi'(x)\varphi(x) x^{-\lambda-\mu} dx\, (\Gamma f_1|f_2).$$

Since $\Gamma$ and $A$ anticommute, we have $(\Gamma f_1|f_2) = 0$ if $\mu \neq -\lambda$. If $\mu = -\lambda$, then integration by parts yields

$$(D\varphi X^{-\lambda} f_1 | \varphi X^{-\mu} f_2) = -(\Gamma f_1|f_2) + (\varphi X^{-\lambda} f_1 | D\varphi X^{-\mu} f_2).$$

Hence,

$$q_D(\varphi X^{-\lambda} f_1 | \varphi X^{-\mu} f_2) = i(\Gamma f_1|f_2)$$

and we reach the conclusion. □

Thus, Corollary 4.2.5 holds true for this operator, too. Since we know $q$, we now also know how to construct self–adjoint extensions. First of all we must have $n_+(D,G) = n_-(D,G)$, i. e.

$$[\ker(\Gamma + i) \cap \ker A] = [\ker(\Gamma - i) \cap \ker A].$$

The operator $\varepsilon = i\Gamma$ defines a grading and $A$ is odd with respect to this grading. Hence $A$ decomposes as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_- \\ A_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to this grading.

We single out the following definition of which we will make use very often in the sequel:

**Proposition and Definition 4.2.7** *With the denotations introduced before we put*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}(A,\varepsilon,G) &:= \operatorname{ind}(A_+,G) \\ &= [\ker(\varepsilon - 1) \cap \ker A] - [\ker(\varepsilon + 1) \cap \ker A] \\ &= n_+(D,G) - n_-(D,G). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

If $\operatorname{ind}(A,\varepsilon,G) = 0$ then we can choose a $G$–invariant reflection, $\sigma$, of $V^\lambda$ which anticommutes with $\Gamma$, and we put

$$\mathcal{D}(D^\lambda_\sigma) := \{f \in \mathcal{D}(D^\lambda) \mid f(0) \in \ker(\sigma - 1)\} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(D_\sigma) := \{f \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\max}) \mid \Phi(f) \in \ker(\sigma - 1)\} \tag{2.7}$$

for $D$ as in (2.4). Obviously, in this way we obtain all $G$–invariant self–adjoint extensions.

We state a condition which guarantees the scalability of $D_\sigma$ in the sense of Definition 2.2.2: if

$$\sigma | \ker(A - \lambda I) = \begin{cases} -1, & 0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1, & -\frac{1}{2} < \lambda < 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sigma_0 := \sigma | \ker A$$

is an arbitrary $G$–invariant reflection anticommuting with $\Gamma$ then the operator $D_\sigma$ is scalable.

## 4.3 The Deficiency Index Theorem and the Cobordism Theorem

Our considerations we have done so far yield a "simple" proof of the Cobordism Theorem, which we will need in the sequel (cf. [P]). Of course, one has to be careful with the word "simple", because after all the source of this result is Proposition 1.3.16, for which we had to work somewhat. The results of this section are an extension of the paper [L1] to the $G$–equivariant case. They had been announced in loc. cit.

**Theorem 4.3.1** (Cobordism Theorem) *Let $M$ be a compact $G$–manifold with boundary and $D$ a $G$–invariant elliptic differential operator of order 1. Assume that $D$ restricted to a collar of the boundary takes the form $D = \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + A)$ as in* (2.1–2.3)*. Then we have* $\operatorname{ind}(A, i\Gamma, G) = 0$ *(cf.* (2.5)*).*

**Proof** We attach a cone, $(0, 1) \times N$, to the boundary of $M$ such that on $(0, \frac{1}{2}) \times N$ we have

$$D = \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{x}A).$$

Then application of Corollary 4.2.5, Corollary 4.2.2 and (2.5) (cf. the end of the last section) yields

$$\operatorname{ind}(A, i\Gamma, G) = n_+(D, G) - n_-(D, G). \tag{3.1}$$

Since $M$ is compact, $D_{\min}$ is Fredholm by Proposition 1.3.16 and the assertion follows from Lemma 4.1.5. □

**Remark** The proof could as well be done by means of the operator $D^\lambda$. Indeed, the Sections 1.4, 1.4.1 show that $D^\lambda_{\min}$ is Fredholm and (3.1) also holds for this operator.

**Theorem 4.3.2** (Deficiency Index Theorem) *Let $M$ be a complete $G$–manifold with conic singularities and $D \in \operatorname{Diff}^{1,1}(M)$ a $G$–invariant symmetric* Chernoff *operator on $M$. Let $N$ be a compact hypersurface which partitions $M$ into $M_\pm$ with common boundary $N$, such that $M_+$ is complete with boundary and the singularities lie in the interior of $M_-$. Assume that $D$ restricted to a tubular neighborhood of $N$, $(-1, 1) \times N$, takes the form $D = \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + A)$ as in* (2.1–2.3)*. Then the $G$–deficiency indices of $D$ are finite and*

$$n_+(D, G) - n_-(D, G) = \operatorname{ind}(A, i\Gamma, G).$$

**Proof** In view of the Cobordism Theorem, we may assume that $N$ is the cone cross section near the singularity. Then the assertion follows immediately from Corollary 4.2.5, Corollary 4.2.2 and (2.5). □

### 4.3.1 $Cl_k$–antilinear Operators

We consider a spin manifold $M$. On $M$ there exists a canonical $Cl_m$–linear Dirac operator [LM, Sec. II.7]. Let $l$ be the left regular representation of $Cl_m$ on itself and put

$$\mathcal{S}(M) := P_{\text{spin}} \times_l Cl_m. \tag{3.2}$$

$\mathcal{S}(M)$ admits a natural $Cl_m$–right action which commutes with the DIRAC operator $\mathcal{D}$. If $M$ is compact then the index of $\mathcal{D}$ is the so–called $\alpha$–invariant of $M$

$$\alpha(M) = \operatorname{ind}_m(\mathcal{D}). \tag{3.3}$$

For the discussion of the deficiency index theorem in this setting, we need the separation of variables for $\mathcal{D}$ on the model cone $N^\wedge$. Hence, put $M = \mathbf{R}_+ \times N$ with metric $dx^2 \oplus x^2 g_N$. Since the representation $l$ of the spin group is induced from a representation of the Clifford algebra, $\mathcal{S}(M)$ is a direct sum of spinor bundles. Therefore, the separation of variables, worked out in [L1, Sec. 5] for the complex case, carries over to this situation as well. Via the identification

$$Cl_{m-1} \to Cl_m^0, \quad e_j \mapsto e_0 \cdot e_j, \quad j = 1, \cdots, m-1$$

we have

$$\mathcal{S}^0(M)|\{1\} \times N \cong \mathcal{S}(N) = P_{\text{spin}} \times_l Cl_{m-1} \tag{3.4}$$

and there exist isometries

$$\psi_{0/1} : L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, L^2(\mathcal{S}(N))) \to L^2(\mathcal{S}^{0/1}(M)),$$

such that

$$\psi_1^*(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{S}^0(M))\psi_0 = E_0(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{x}\mathcal{D}^N). \tag{3.5}$$

Here $E_0$ denotes Clifford multiplication by $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$. Now there is a parallel $Cl_m$–right action on $\mathcal{S}(M)$. Let $F_0 \in Cl_m$ be an element with $F_0^2 = -1$ and

$$E_0 \cdot F_0 = -1. \tag{3.6}$$

Denote by $R_{F_0}$ right multiplication by $F_0$. We put

$$Q := R_{F_0} \circ \mathcal{D} : C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(\mathcal{S}(N))) \to C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+, C^\infty(\mathcal{S}(N))). \tag{3.7}$$

We find

$$\begin{gathered} Q = \Phi\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{x}P, \\ P = \Phi\mathcal{D}^N, \quad \Phi^* = \Phi,\ \Phi^2 = I,\ \Phi P = -P\Phi,\ P^* = -P. \end{gathered} \tag{3.8}$$

An analogous construction can be done for the metric cylinder $M = \mathbf{R}_+ \times N, g = dx^2 \oplus g_N$. There, one checks completely analogous that $Q$ has the form

$$Q = \Phi\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - P. \tag{3.9}$$

Furthermore, we remark that $-\Phi$ is the grading automorphism of $\mathcal{S}(N)$. This is easily seen from

$$E_0(E_0 E_{j_1} \cdots E_0 E_{j_k})F_0 = (-1)^{k+1} E_0 E_{j_1} \cdots E_0 E_{j_k}.$$

We are mainly interested in the operator $Q$. Nevertheless, the following results can be derived for arbitrary operators which have the form (3.8) on a cone.

**Lemma 4.3.3** *Let $N$ be a compact manifold and $E$ a $Cl_k$–*DIRAC *bundle over $N$* [LM, Def. II.7.2]. *Let $-\Phi$ be the grading automorphism and $P$ an odd, $Cl_k$–antilinear, antisymmetric, elliptic differential operator on $E$. Then the $Cl_k$–deficiency index of the operator*

$$Q = \Phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{x} P$$

*is given by*

$$\text{def-ind}_k(Q) = \text{ind}_k(P).$$

**Proof** Let

$$V_\lambda(P) := \ker (P^2 + \lambda^2).$$

Analogous to the considerations in Section 4.2.1, we find that

$$E(Q) \cong \ker (P) \oplus \sum_{0<\lambda<\frac{1}{2}} V_\lambda(P).$$

Putting

$$E_{k+1} := \lambda^{-1} P | V_\lambda(P),$$

we obtain a $\mathbf{Z}_2$–graded $Cl_{k+1}$–module structure on $V_\lambda(P)$, thus

$$[E(Q)] = [\ker\ P].$$

It remains to check that the grading on $\ker P$ induced by $E(Q)$ indeed has grading operator $-\Phi$. Take

$$f \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, \ker\ P)$$

with

$$Qf = \varepsilon f, \quad \varepsilon = \pm 1.$$

Writing

$$f(x) = f_+(x) + f_-(x), \quad f_\pm \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+, \ker\ P \cap \ker (\Phi \mp I)),$$

we find

$$f_\pm(x) = e^{\pm \varepsilon x} f_\pm(0)$$

and hence we are done. □

We state the analogues of Theorem 4.3.1 and Theorem 4.3.2. In view of the preceding lemma, their proofs are completely analogous and therefore they will be omitted.

**Theorem 4.3.4** ($Cl_k$–Cobordism Theorem) *Let $M$ be a compact manifold with boundary and $Q$ an antisymmetric, $Cl_k$–antilinear, elliptic differential operator of order 1. Assume furthermore that $Q$ has the form* (3.9) *on a collar of the boundary. Then* $\text{ind}_k(P) = 0$.

*In particular, if the spin manifold $M$ bounds then $\alpha(M) = 0$.*

**Theorem 4.3.5** ($Cl_k$–Deficiency Index Theorem) *Let $M$ be a complete manifold with conic singularities and $Q \in \mathrm{Diff}^{1,1}(M)$ an antisymmetric $Cl_k$–antilinear* Chernoff *operator. Assume furthermore that $Q$ has the form* (3.8) *near the cone tip. Let $N$ be a compact hypersurface that partitions $M$ into $M_\pm$ with common boundary $N$, such that $M_+$ is complete with boundary and the singularities lie in the interior of $M_-$. Assume that $Q$ has the form* (3.9) *in a tubular neighborhood, $(-1,1) \times N$, of $N$. Then the deficiency indices of $Q$ are finite and*

$$\text{def-ind}_k(Q) = \mathrm{ind}_k(P).$$

*In particular, if $Q$ is the $Cl_m$–*Dirac *operator $\mathcal{D}$, then* $\text{def-ind}_{m-1}(\mathcal{D}) = \alpha(N)$.

We give an application. Let $M$ be a complete Riemannian manifold. We say that $M$ has strictly positive scalar curvature at infinity if there exists a compact set $K \subset M$, such that the scalar curvature, $s$, satisfies $s|(M \setminus K) \geq c > 0$. Note that there is no assumption on $s$ over $K$. The following theorem is an improvement of Theorem 4.3.4.

**Theorem 4.3.6** *Let $M$ be a complete Riemannian spin manifold with compact boundary $N$. If $M$ has strictly positive scalar curvature at infinity then $\alpha(N) = 0$.*

A consequence of this theorem is that a compact spin manifold, $N$, with $\alpha(N) \neq 0$ cannot bound a complete Riemannian spin manifold having strictly positive scalar curvature at infinity. In particular, the cylinder $\mathbf{R} \times N$ does not admit a complete metric with strictly positive scalar curvature at infinity.

**Proof** After deformation of the metric near the boundary, we may assume that the metric is product near the boundary. We attach a cone to the boundary. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the $Cl_m$–Dirac operator on the resulting manifold $\widetilde{M}$. By Theorem 4.3.5 we have

$$\text{def-ind}_{m-1}(\mathcal{D}) = \alpha(N).$$

On the other hand, we have in view of the Lichnerowicz formula [LM, Theorem II.8.8],

$$\mathcal{D}^t\mathcal{D} = \nabla^t\nabla + \frac{1}{4}s,$$

thus, by an easy adaption of Proposition 3.2.9 (cf. the remark at the end of Section 3.2), $\mathcal{D}$ is Fredholm and hence, by Theorem 4.1.14, $\text{def-ind}_m(\mathcal{D}) = 0$ which is a contradiction! □

## 4.4 Dirac–Schrödinger Operators

Dirac–Schrödinger operators are obtained by adding a potential to a symmetric (Chernoff) operator. In general, this destroys the symmetry and we obtain operators which may have an interesting index. Before stating the definition, we begin with an observation about the heat kernel of symmetric operators.

**Lemma 4.4.1** *Let* $P \in \mathrm{Diff}^{1,1}(N^\wedge, E)$ *be symmetric and of the form* (2.4)*. Then we have, for* $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ *with* $\varphi \equiv 1$ *near* 0 *and* $g \in G$*,*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\varphi g^*(e^{-tP_{\min}P_{\max}} - e^{-tP_{\max}P_{\min}})) = \frac{1}{2}n(P,g) + O(t^N), \quad t \to 0,$$

*for arbitrary large* $N$*. Here we have abbreviated* $n(P,g) := n_+(P,g) + n_-(P,g)$*.*

**Proof** Since $P$ is symmetric, the local heat invariants of $P_{\max}P_{\min}$ and $P_{\min}P_{\max}$ coincide. Consequently, by Theorem 2.4.6 only the power $t^0$ occurs in the heat asymptotics. The constant term is

$$a := \frac{1}{2}\Big(\mathrm{Res}_0(\Gamma\hat{\zeta}_g(P_{\min}P_{\max}))(0) - \mathrm{Res}_0(\Gamma\hat{\zeta}_g(P_{\max}P_{\min}))(0)\Big).$$

Analogous to the consideration after Proposition 2.3.12, we find

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\max}P_{\min} &= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathrm{spec}\ A} L_{q^+(\lambda)} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{V_\lambda}, \\ P_{\min}P_{\max} &= \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathrm{spec}\ A} L_{q^-(\lambda)} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{V_\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} q^+(\lambda) &= |\lambda + \frac{1}{2}|, \\ q^-(\lambda) &= \begin{cases} |\lambda + \frac{1}{2}|, & |\lambda| \geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ -\lambda - \frac{1}{2}, & |\lambda| < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 2.3.12 we infer

$$\begin{aligned} a &= -\sum_{q^-(\lambda)<0} q^-(\lambda)\mathrm{tr}(g^*_\lambda) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}n(P,g) + \sum_{|\lambda|<\frac{1}{2}} \lambda\,\mathrm{tr}(g^*_\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}n(P,g), \end{aligned}$$

since $A$ and $\Gamma$ anticommute. □

This proof proceeded just by direct computation using heavily the cone structure. Nevertheless, this lemma has a considerable generalization (see Lemma 4.4.6 below).

Next we fix the setting for the rest of this section:

Let $M$ be as in (3.2.1), where a compact group of isometries acts on $M$, leaving $U$ invariant. (4.1)

Let $D_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$ be a $G$–equivariant CHERNOFF operator on $M$ and $D$ a symmetric $G$–invariant closed extension with finite deficiency indices. (4.2)

Assume that $D$ has the property (SE) over $U$. (4.3)

**Definition 4.4.2** *Let $A \in C_0^\infty(\mathrm{End}(E))$ be a self–adjoint $G$–equivariant bundle homomorphism. The operator $D + iA$ will be called a* DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operator *if the following holds:*

(i) *$A$ is uniformly bounded, i. e. $|A|_\infty < \infty$.*

(ii) *there exists a $U$–compact subset $K$, $U \subset K \subset M$, such that*

$$A^2|M \setminus K \geq c > 0.$$

(iii) *$[D, A]$ is a bounded operator of order 0, i. e. $|[D, A]|_\infty < \infty$.*

*The latter also means that $A$ maps the domain of $D$ into itself.*

*In addition, we say that $[D, A]$ vanishes at infinity, if for given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $U$–compact subset $K$ such that $|[D, A](x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for $x \in M \setminus K$.*

**Proposition 4.4.3** *Let $D + i\lambda A$ be a* DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER *operator. Then there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that the operator $D + i\lambda A$ is* FREDHOLM *for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. If $[D, A]$ vanishes at infinity then $D + i\lambda A$ is* FREDHOLM *for all $\lambda > 0$.*

**Proof** We use the criterion Proposition 3.2.8, Proposition 3.2.9 (cf. also the remark at the end of Section 3.2).

Pick $s \in \mathcal{D}(D^*D)$. Since $A : \mathcal{D}(D) \to \mathcal{D}(D)$ and $D$ is symmetric, we find

$$(D + i\lambda A)^*(D + i\lambda A)s = D^*Ds + i\lambda[D, A]s + \lambda^2 A^2 s,$$

thus

$$D^*D + i\lambda[D, A] + \lambda^2 A^2 \subset (D + i\lambda A)^*(D + i\lambda A).$$

This implies equality since both operators are self–adjoint. For $(D + i\lambda A)(D + i\lambda A)^*$ one computes analogously

$$(D + i\lambda A)(D + i\lambda A)^* = DD^* - i\lambda[D, A] + \lambda^2 A^2.$$

By Definition 4.4.2 (ii), there is a $U$–compact set $K$, $U \subset K \subset M$, such that $A^2|M \setminus K \geq c > 0$. Hence, if $\lambda$ is large enough, we find that

$$(D + i\lambda A)^*(D + i\lambda A) - D^*D \quad \text{and} \quad (D + i\lambda A)(D + i\lambda A)^* - DD^* \tag{4.4}$$

are positive at infinity.

If $[D, A]$ vanishes at infinity then the operators in (4.4) are positive at infinity for any $\lambda > 0$.

By Proposition 3.2.8 and Proposition 3.2.9 we reach the conclusion. □

**Remarks** 1. In the sequel, we will incorporate $\lambda_0$ into the potential $A$. When we speak of a DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operator $D + iA$, we will assume implicitly that $\lambda_0 = 1$ and hence $D + iA$ is FREDHOLM.

2. The character ring $R(G)$ is in a natural way a subring of the ring of class functions on $G$. If we multiply elements of $R(G)$ by rational numbers one may think of doing this within the ring of class functions.

We note two simple properties of the index of DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operators. Strictly speaking, the index of a DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operator behaves like a deficiency index. Namely, we have

**Proposition 4.4.4** *Let* $D+iA$ *be a* DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER *operator. Then*

$$\operatorname{ind}(D+iA,G)+\operatorname{ind}(D-iA,G)=-n(D,G).$$

*In particular, this is* 0 *if* $M$ *is complete.*

**Proof** We have

$$\begin{aligned}-\operatorname{ind}(D+iA,G) &= \operatorname{ind}(D^*-iA,G)\\ &= \operatorname{ind}((D-iA)_{\max},G)\\ &= n(D,G)+\operatorname{ind}(D-iA,G).\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used the $G$–equivariant analogue of Lemma 1.3.15. Namely, if

$$\alpha:\mathcal{D}(D)\hookrightarrow\mathcal{D}(D_{\max})$$

is the natural inclusion then $\alpha$ is a $G$–equivariant FREDHOLM operator with

$$\operatorname{ind}(\alpha,G)=-n(D,G)$$

and we have

$$D-iA=(D-iA)_{\max}\circ\alpha.$$ □

**Proposition 4.4.5** *Let* $D+iA$ *be a* DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER *operator. Assume furthermore that* $[D,A]$ *vanishes at infinity and that* $D+t_0$ *is* FREDHOLM *for some* $t_0\in\mathbf{R}$. *Then*

$$\operatorname{ind}(D+iA,G)=-\frac{1}{2}n(D,G).$$

*In particular, if* $D$ *is self–adjoint and has a gap in its essential spectrum then* $\operatorname{ind}(D+iA,G)=0$.

**Proof** $D+t+i\lambda A$ is a DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operator for $t\in\mathbf{R}$, $\lambda\in\mathbf{R}\setminus\{0\}$. Moreover it is FREDHOLM, because $[D,A]$ vanishes at infinity. If $D+t_0$ itself is FREDHOLM then we find in view of Lemma 4.1.5

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{ind}(D+iA,G) &= \operatorname{ind}(D+t_0+iA,G)\\ &= \operatorname{ind}(D+t_0,G)\\ &= -n_+(D,G)=-n_-(D,G)=-\frac{1}{2}n(D,G).\end{aligned}$$ □

Now we can state a generalization of Lemma 4.4.1.

**Lemma 4.4.6** *Let* $m=\dim M$ *be odd and* $G$ *orientation preserving. Let* $W\subset U$ *such that* $U$ *is relative* $W$*–compact, and let* $\varphi\in C^\infty_U(M)$ *be* $G$*–invariant with* $\varphi|W\equiv 1$. *Then, for* $g\in G$, *there is an asymptotic expansion*

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\varphi g^*(e^{-tD_{\min}D_{\max}}-e^{-tD_{\max}D_{\min}}))=\sum_{n=0}^{m}a_n t^{\frac{n-m}{2}}+o(1),\quad t\to 0,$$

*where* $a_0=\frac{1}{2}n(D,g)$.

Here, the "small o", $o(1), t\to 0$, stands for any function $\varphi(t)$ such that $\lim\limits_{t\to 0}\varphi(t)=0$.

**Proof** We choose a $G$–invariant function $f \in C^\infty_U(M)$ with $f|U \equiv 1$. Let $\psi \in C^\infty_U(M)$ be $G$–invariant with $\psi|\operatorname{supp}(f) \equiv 1$. Since $[D, f] = \sigma_D(df)$ has compact support, i.e. is vanishing at infinity, the operators

$$D_\pm := D_{\max/\min} + i(1 - f)$$

are Dirac–Schrödinger operators. Note that $D_{\max/\min} + i(1 - f)$ are Fredholm operators in view of Proposition 4.4.3, whence $\lambda_0 = 1$. Since $f$ has $U$–compact support,

$$D_\pm + itf, \quad 0 \le t \le 1, \tag{4.5}$$

is a continuous family of Fredholm operators and Lemma 4.1.5 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}(D_-, g) &= -n_+(D, g), \\ \operatorname{ind}(D_+, g) &= n_-(D, g). \end{aligned}$$

In view of Theorem 3.5.10 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n(D, g) &= \operatorname{ind}(D_+, D_-, g) \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}(\psi g^*(e^{-tD_+^*D_+} - e^{-tD_+D_+^*})) - \operatorname{Tr}(\psi g^*(e^{-tD_-^*D_-} - e^{-tD_-D_-^*})) + o(t). \end{aligned}$$

The operators $D_+$ and $D_{\max}$ resp. $D_-$ and $D_{\min}$ coincide on $U$. Hence Theorem 1.4.11 implies

$$\begin{aligned} n(D, g) = {} & 2\operatorname{Tr}(\varphi g^*(e^{-tD_{\min}D_{\max}} - e^{-tD_{\max}D_{\min}})) + \operatorname{Tr}((\psi - \varphi)g^*(e^{-tD_+^*D_+} - e^{-tD_+D_+^*})) \\ & -\operatorname{Tr}((\psi - \varphi)g^*(e^{-tD_-^*D_-} - e^{-tD_-D_-^*})) + o(t). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\psi - \varphi$ has compact support, the assertion follows from Theorem 1.1.18 and its supplement. □

**Proposition 4.4.7** *Let $m$ be odd and $G$ orientation preserving. Let $P_j = D_j + iA_j$, $j = 1, 2$, be* Dirac–Schrödinger *operators which coincide at infinity (cf. Section* 3.4*). Then their relative index is*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}(P_{1,\max}, P_{2,\max}, G) &= \frac{1}{2}n(D_1, G) - \frac{1}{2}n(D_2, G), \\ \operatorname{ind}(P_{1,\min}, P_{2,\min}, G) &= \frac{1}{2}n(D_2, G) - \frac{1}{2}n(D_1, G). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** Let $K_j$ be $U_j$–compact sets in $M_j$, $j = 1, 2$, such that the $P_j$ coincide outside $K_j$. We choose $G$–invariant functions $f_j \in C^\infty(M_j)$, $f_j|K_j \equiv 0$, and $f_j \equiv 1$ outside a $K_j$–compact subset of $M_j$. Since $A_j$ is bounded and $D_j$ has the Rellich property, we find

$$\operatorname{ind}(D_j + iA_j, G) = \operatorname{ind}(D_j + if_jA_j, G)$$

(cf. (4.5)). With the same consideration as in the proof of Lemma 4.4.6 we obtain, for $g \in G$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}(P_{1,\max}, P_{2,\max}, g) &= \lim_{t\to 0}\Big(\int_{K_1} \operatorname{tr}((g^*(e^{-tD_1D_1^*} - e^{-tD_1^*D_1}))(x, x))dx \\ &\qquad - \int_{K_2} \operatorname{tr}((g^*(e^{-tD_2D_2^*} - e^{-tD_2^*D_2}))(x, x))dx\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}n(D_1, g) - \frac{1}{2}n(D_2, g). \end{aligned}$$

Since $g \in G$ was arbitrary, the first assertion follows. For the minimal extensions the proof is completely analogous. □

Next we want to compute the $G$–index of a Dirac–Schrödinger operator $P = D + iA$. However, we are only able to do this under some additional assumptions. Namely, we assume that $M$ is partitioned into $M_\pm$ by a compact hypersurface $N$, such that

(i) $M_+$ is complete with compact boundary $N$,

(ii) The "singularity set", $U$, satisfies $U \subset M_- \setminus N$,

(iii) $A^2 | M_+ \geq c > 0$,

(iv) There is a tubular neighborhood, $(-1,1) \times N$, around $N$ such that $D|(-1,1) \times N$ has the form
$$D = \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + S)$$
as in (2.1–2.3).

We note that (i)–(iii) can always be arranged by choosing $M_-$ large enough. By deformation of the metric (iv) can always be arranged for Dirac operators.

First we choose a $G$–invariant function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ with $f \equiv 0$ on $M_- \setminus ([-\frac{1}{2}, 1) \times N)$ and $f \equiv 1$ on $M_+$. In a neighborhood of $M_+$ we put
$$\widetilde{A} := A(A^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$
and consider the operator
$$D + if\widetilde{A}.$$

**Lemma 4.4.8** *$D + if\widetilde{A}$ is a* Dirac–Schrödinger *operator and, for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 > 0$, $D + i\lambda f\widetilde{A}$ has the same $G$–index as $P$.*

**Proof** For proving the first assertion it suffices to show that $[D, \widetilde{A}]$ restricted to $M_+$ is a uniformly bounded operator of order 0. Since
$$[D, \widetilde{A}] = [D, A](A^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + A[D, (A^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$$
it is enough to show this for $[D, (A^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}]$. On $M_+$ we have the pointwise identity
$$(A^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty (A^2 + x^2)^{-1} dx \tag{4.6}$$
and the first assertion follows from
$$[D, (A^2 + x^2)^{-1}] = -(A^2 + x^2)^{-1} [D, A^2] (A^2 + x^2)^{-1}$$
and $[D, A^2] = [D, A]A + A[D, A]$.

Now, for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,
$$D + i\lambda(ft\widetilde{A} + (1-t)A), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$
is a continuous family of Fredholm operators and the second assertion is a consequence of the stability of the Fredholm index. □

Now let $E|M_+ =: E_+ \oplus E_-$ be the decomposition into the $\pm 1$–eigenbundles of $\widetilde{A}$. Since the principal symbol of $D$ commutes with $\widetilde{A}$, we can modify $D$ and $\widetilde{A}$ on the tube $(-1,1) \times N$, without changing the index, such that

- $\widetilde{A}|(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}) \times N$ commutes with $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$,
- $[D,\widetilde{A}]|(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}) \times N = 0$.

Then $D|(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}) \times N$ has the form

$$D = D_+ \oplus D_-,$$

where

$$D_\pm = \Gamma_\pm(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + S_\pm)$$

is as in (2.1–2.3). Here $D_\pm$ lives on $L^2((-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}), L^2(E_\pm|N))$.

**Theorem 4.4.9** *Let $m$ be odd and $G$ orientation preserving. The $G$–index of the* DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER *operator $D + iA$ is given by*

$$\operatorname{ind}(D_{\max/\min} + iA, G) = \pm\frac{1}{2}n(D,G) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{ind}(S_+, i\Gamma_+, G) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{ind}(S_-, i\Gamma_-, G).$$

**Remarks** We comment on two special cases.

1. Theorem 4.4.9 contains a generalization of the Deficiency Index Theorem 4.3.2. Namely, if $A = I$ then $D = D_+$ and we obtain

$$-n_+(D,G) = \operatorname{ind}(D_{\min} + i, G) = -\frac{1}{2}n(D,G) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{ind}(S_+, i\Gamma_+, G),$$

thus

$$n_+(D,G) - n_-(D,G) = \operatorname{ind}(S_+, i\Gamma_+, G).$$

Note that in this Section we have proved this result under weaker assumptions ((4.2), (4.3)) than in Theorem 4.3.2.

2. If the "singularity set" $U$ is empty, i. e. $M$ is complete, then $N$ bounds and by virtue of the Cobordism Theorem 4.3.1, we obtain $\operatorname{ind}(S_-, i\Gamma_-, G) = -\operatorname{ind}(S_+, i\Gamma_+, G)$, thus

$$\operatorname{ind}(D + i, G) = -\operatorname{ind}(S_+, i\Gamma_+, G).$$

For trivial $G = \{1\}$, this is [A2, Theorem 1.5]. Note that we have another sign convention than loc. cit. This explains the different signs in the index formula.

**Proof** We extend $D_\pm$ to $M_+$ by $D_\pm := \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \widetilde{A})D\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \widetilde{A})$ and obtain

$$(D + i\lambda\widetilde{A})|M_+ = \begin{pmatrix} D_+ + i\lambda & -\frac{1}{2}[D,\widetilde{A}]|E_- \\ \frac{1}{2}[D,\widetilde{A}]|E_+ & D_- - i\lambda \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to the decomposition $E|M_+ =: E_+ \oplus E_-$. If $\lambda$ is large enough then

$$T_{\lambda,t} := D + i\lambda f\widetilde{A} - tf\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2}[D,\widetilde{A}]|E_- \\ \frac{1}{2}[D,\widetilde{A}]|E_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \le t \le 1,$$

is a FREDHOLM deformation and we obtain, putting $T_\lambda := T_{\lambda,1}$,

$$\operatorname{ind}(D + i\lambda A, G) = \operatorname{ind}(T_\lambda, G).$$

Here we have

$$T_\lambda | M_+ = \begin{pmatrix} D_+ + i\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & D_- - i\lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

We attach a cone $(0,1) \times N$ to $M_+$ and extend $D_\pm$ to an operator $D'_\pm$ onto $(0,1) \times N \cup M_+$ such that near the cone tip

$$D'_\pm = \Gamma_\pm\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{x} S_\pm\right).$$

Now, the Deficiency Index Theorem 4.3.2 and the Relative Index Theorem for DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operators 4.4.7 yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ind}(D_{\max} + i\lambda A, G) &= \operatorname{ind}(T_{\lambda,\max}, G) \\
&= \operatorname{ind}(T_{\lambda,\max}, T'_{\lambda,\max}, G) + \operatorname{ind}(T'_{\lambda,\max}, G) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} n(D, G) - \frac{1}{2} n(D'_+, G) - \frac{1}{2} n(D'_-, G) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{ind}(D'_{+,\max} + i\lambda, G) + \operatorname{ind}(D'_{-,\max} - i\lambda, G) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} n(D, G) + \frac{1}{2}(n_-(D'_+, G) - n_+(D'_+, G)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}(n_+(D'_-, G) - n_-(D'_-, G)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} n(D, G) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{ind}(S_+, i\Gamma_+, G) + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{ind}(S_-, i\Gamma_-, G).
\end{aligned}$$

For $D_{\min}$ the proof is completely analogous. □

# Bibliographic Notes

The theory of deficiency indices of symmetric operators in a complex HILBERT space goes probably back to VON NEUMANN. The generalization to equivariant operators with finite dimensional deficiency spaces is due to the author.

This chapter is an elaboration of [L2], where most of the results have been announced.

The localization principle for deficiency indices (Theorem 4.2.1) was proved in [L1, Sec. 2] for the complex case. The predecessor of Corollary 4.2.5 is [L1, Prop. 4.1].

Section 4.3 is the generalization of the main result in loc. cit. to the $Cl_k$–equivariant setting.

Theorem 4.3.6 has been discovered by several people in different versions. For dimensions divisible by four the result is due to GROMOV and LAWSON [GL, Corollary 6.13 (iv)] and later ANGHEL [A2, Theorem 2.1]. In dimensions divisible by four the $\alpha$–invariant is equivalent to the $\hat{A}$–genus and in loc. cit. the result is stated with the $\hat{A}$–genus instead of the $\alpha$–invariant. Our proof of Theorem 4.3.6 is in the spirit of [A2]. The present generalization via the $\alpha$–invariant has been obtained independently by BUNKE [Bu2].

The results of Section 4.4 have a long history and it is impossible to give proper credit to all people who contributed results. We explicitly refer to the papers [Ca1, R1, H, BM, A1, A2, Bu2, Ra] without claiming that this list is complete. Our exposition follows [A1, A2] very closely. It was our aim to present the deficiency index theorem for symmetric Chernoff operators and the index theorem for Dirac–Schrödinger operators in a unified way. The result is Theorem 4.4.9.

Finally we explicitly mention that for complete manifolds Proposition 4.4.5 is due to J. Roe (cf. [R1, Proposition 2.8]).

It is possible to extend the results of Section 4.4 to real Dirac–Schrödinger operators. This is similar to the $Cl_k$–Deficiency Index Theorem. It is a routine matter and we leave the details to the reader (cf. also [Bu2]).

# CHAPTER V

# $\eta$–Functions

## Summary

This chapter can be viewed as an appendix to Chapters I and II. In Chapter II $\eta$–invariants played a crucial role. They appeared in certain singular heat expansions. Moreover they are the boundary correction term in the index theorem of ATIYAH, PATODI, and SINGER resp. in the index theorem for manifolds with conical singularities Theorem 2.4.8. Thus, it seems appropriate to look a bit more closely at these spectral invariants.

The $\eta$–function of an elliptic operator, $P$, is defined to be

$$\eta(P,s) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})} \int_0^\infty t^{(s-1)/2} \mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2}) dt.$$

In view of Section 2.1 the function $\eta(P,s)$ has a meromorphic continuation to $\mathbf{C}$ if the function $t \mapsto \mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2})$ lies in the space $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. However, for deriving an asymptotic expansion of $\mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2})$ the meromorphic extendability of $\eta(P,s)$ is not sufficient.

In Section 5.1 we therefore investigate quite abstractly the relation between asymptotic expansions as $t \to 0, t \to \infty$ of a real function and the meromorphic continuation of its MELLIN transform. It turns out that these two properties are equivalent if one considers asymptotic expansions which can be differentiated and meromorphic functions with certain estimates on finite vertical strips (Theorems 5.1.4 and 5.1.5). This yields a soft proof of the fact that $\zeta$–functions of classical pseudodifferential operators on a compact manifold are of subexponential growth on finite vertical strips. Actually, they are of polynomial growth but our method is not able to prove this. However, our method is completely elementary while for proving the polynomial growth one has to use the wave trace expansion a la DUISTERMAAT and GUILLEMIN [DG], which is highly nontrivial and works well only for operators with scalar principal symbol.

In Section 5.2 we discuss the asymptotic behavior of $\mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2}), t \to 0+$, for differential operators of FUCHS type. Technically, this is parallel to the discussion of the heat trace, such that the presentation can be given more concisely than in Chapter II.

As a by-product we also achieve the meromorphic extension of the $\eta$–function of operators of APS type. The crucial Lemma 5.2.4 shows that for these operators the local invariants of $\mathrm{Tr}(De^{-tD^2})$ vanish on a cylinder. Here again, as well as for the proof of the variation formula in Section 5.3, our point of view is an axiomatic one. The existence of the $\eta$–function and the variation formula follow from the axioms (5.2.6)–(5.2.8).

Finally, in Section 5.4 we give a brief glimpse at the gluing formula for the $\eta$–invariant. The idea for proving this is very simple and can be explained within a few lines (cf. (4.5a, b)). However, although the proof has been simplified considerably since the first proof of BUNKE [Bu3], it is still beyond the scope of this book and hence will be omitted.

## 5.1 $\zeta$– and $\eta$–Functions

In this section we restrict the class of functions $\mathcal{L}_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ defined in Definition 2.1.1:

**Definition 5.1.1** *We denote by* $C^\infty_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ *the class of all functions* $f \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}_+)$, *such that the following holds:*

(1) *There are asymptotic expansions*

$$f(x) \quad \sim_{x\searrow 0} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{m_j^0} a_{jk}\, x^{\alpha_j}\, \log^k x, \tag{1.1}$$

$$f(x) \quad \sim_{x\nearrow \infty} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{m_j^\infty} b_{jk}\, x^{\beta_j}\, \log^k x, \tag{1.2}$$

*with* $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in \mathbf{C}, (\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha_j)$ *increasing,* $(\mathrm{Re}\ \beta_j)$ *decreasing, and* $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \mathrm{Re}\ \alpha_j = +\infty$, $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \mathrm{Re}\ \beta_j = -\infty$.

(2) *The asymptotic expansions* (1.1), (1.2) *can be differentiated, i.e.:*

$$\forall_{K\in\mathbf{Z}_+}\forall_N : \Big|\partial_x^K\big(f(x) - \sum_{\mathrm{Re}\ \alpha_k\le N+K} a_{jk}\, x^{\alpha_j}\, \log^k x\big)\Big| = O(x^N), \quad x\to 0, \tag{1.3}$$

*and, similarly,*

$$\forall_{K\in\mathbf{Z}_+}\forall_N : \Big|\partial_x^K\big(f(x) - \sum_{\mathrm{Re}\ \beta_k\ge -N+K} a_{jk}\, x^{\alpha_j}\, \log^k x\big)\Big| = O(x^{-N}), \quad x\to \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

As in Section 2.1 we will use the notation (2.1.5) for convenience. Obviously, $\partial_x$ maps $C^\infty_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ into itself.

In view of Proposition and Definition 2.1.2 the MELLIN transform is well defined on $C^\infty_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Moreover, for $f \in C^\infty_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ the MELLIN transform,

$$(Mf)(z) := {\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_0^\infty x^{z-1} f(x)dx, \tag{1.5}$$

is a meromorphic function in the complex plane.

Our aim is to characterize the space $MC^\infty_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Let $f \in C^\infty_{\rm as}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. Then in view of (1.3) and (1.4) we can integrate by parts in (1.5) and obtain

$$(Mf)(z) = \frac{(-1)^k}{z(z+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(z+k-1)}(Mf^{(k)})(z). \tag{1.6}$$

**Proposition 5.1.2** *Let $f \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$, $c, d \in \mathbf{R}$. Then, for $c \le \mathrm{Re}\, z \le d$ and $N \ge 0$ we have an estimate*

$$|(Mf)(z)| \le C_N |z|^{-N}, \quad |z| \ge z_0 > 0. \tag{1.7}$$

**Proof** Once we have proved the estimate

$$|(Mf)(z)| \le C, \quad |z| \ge z_0 > 0 \tag{1.7a}$$

for any $f \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ then the estimate (1.7) will follow from (1.6) and (1.7a) applied to $f^{(N)}$.

To prove (1.7a) we write

$$(Mf)(z) = \int_0^1 x^{z-1} f(x)dx + \int_1^\infty x^{z-1} f(x)dx. \tag{1.8}$$

To estimate the first integral we write

$$f(x) = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{Re}\, \alpha \le -c+1 \\ 0 \le k \le k(\alpha)}} a_{\alpha k}\, x^\alpha \log^k x + f_1(x)$$

with $f_1(x) = O(x^{-c+1}),\ x \to 0$.

Then we have for $c \le \mathrm{Re}\, z \le d$

$$\left| \int_0^1 x^{z-1} f_1(x) dx \right| \le C$$

and

$$\left| \int_0^1 x^{z-1+\alpha} \log^k x dx \right| \le C |z+\alpha|^{-k-1},$$

hence

$$\left| \int_0^1 f(x) x^{z-1} dx \right| \le C, \quad |z| \ge z_0 > 0.$$

The estimate of the second integral in (1.8) is completely analogous. □

**Definition 5.1.3** *We put $C^\infty_{\mathrm{as},0}(\mathbf{R}_+) := \{ f \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+) \,|\, \mathrm{spec}_\infty(f) = \emptyset \}$. I.e. $C^\infty_{\mathrm{as},0}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ consists of all functions $f \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ such that $x^\alpha \partial_x^\beta f(x)$ is bounded for $x \ge 1$ for arbitrary $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{Z}_+$.*

**Theorem 5.1.4** *$MC^\infty_{\mathrm{as},0}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ consists of those meromorphic functions in the complex plane, $h \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{C})$, such that*

(i) *$h(z)$ is holomorphic for $\mathrm{Re}\, z > c$, $c$ some real number depending on $h$,*

(ii) *for any $a, b \in \mathbf{R}, a < b$ there exists $R > 0$, such that $h$ is holomorphic in $\Gamma_{a,b} \cap \{ z \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, |z| \ge R \}$ and*

$$|h(z)| \le C_N |z|^{-N}, \quad z \in \Gamma_{a,b}, |z| \ge R.$$

**Proof** If $f \in C^\infty_{\text{as},0}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ then properties (i), (ii) follow from Proposition 5.1.2.

Conversely, consider $h \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{C})$ with (i), (ii). We put for $a > c$

$$f(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_a} x^{-z} h(z)dz.$$

In view of (ii) the integral is independent of $a > c$. Furthermore, (ii) implies that we can shift the contour of integration.

Thus, for any $b < a$ with no poles of $h$ on $\Gamma_b$ we find

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_b} x^{-z} h(z)dz + \sum_{z\in\Gamma_{b,a}} \operatorname{Res}_1(x^{-z}h(z)).$$

Now it is easy to check that this gives the desired asymptotic expansion for $f$. Moreover $Mf = h$. □

Similar one proves

**Theorem 5.1.5** *$h \in MC^\infty_{\text{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$ if and only if*

(i) *$h \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{C})$,*

(ii) *for any $a, b \in \mathbf{R}, a < b$ there exists $R > 0$, such that $h$ is holomorphic in $\Gamma_{a,b} \cap \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid |z| \geq R\}$ and*

$$|h(z)| \leq C_N |z|^{-N}, \quad z \in \Gamma_{a,b}, |z| \geq R.$$

Theorems 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 tell us in what sense asymptotic expansions as $t \to \infty, t \to 0$ of a function are equivalent to the meromorphic extendability of its MELLIN transform. Proposition and Definition 2.1.2 states that $Mf$ has a meromorphic continuation for any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. However, it seems hard to characterize the space $M\mathcal{L}_{\text{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$.

We note an application. Let $Q$ be a classical pseudodifferential operator on a compact manifold $M$, $\dim M = m$, $\operatorname{ord} Q =: q$. Choose another classical elliptic pseudodifferential operator $P \geq 0$, $\operatorname{ord} P =: p$. Then one has the following asymptotic expansion ([GrSe, Theorem 2.7])

$$\operatorname{Tr}(Qe^{-tP}) \sim_{t\searrow 0} \sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j(Q,P)\, t^{(j-m-q)/p} + \sum_{j=0}^\infty b_j(Q,P)\, t^j \,\log t. \tag{1.9}$$

Since this expansion result also applies to

$$\partial_t^k \operatorname{Tr}(Qe^{-tP}) = (-1)^k \operatorname{Tr}(QP^k e^{-tP})$$

we conclude that (1.9) is an expansion as in (1.3). Moreover, we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}(Qe^{-tP}) \sim_{t\nearrow\infty} \operatorname{Tr}(Q|\ker(P))$$

in the sense of (1.4). Hence

$$t \longmapsto \operatorname{Tr}(Qe^{-tP}) - \operatorname{Tr}(Q|\ker(P))$$

is a function in $C^\infty_{\text{as},0}(\mathbf{R}_+)$.

Next we consider the $\zeta$–function

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{Q,P}(s) &:= \operatorname{Tr}(QP^{-s}) = \sum_{\lambda\in\operatorname{spec} P\setminus\{0\}} \operatorname{Tr}(Q|\ker(P-\lambda))\lambda^{-s}\\ &= \Gamma(s)^{-1}\int_0^\infty t^{s-1}[\operatorname{Tr}(Qe^{-tP})-\operatorname{Tr}(Q|\ker(P))]dt, \quad \operatorname{Re} s >> 0. \quad (1.10)\end{aligned}$$

In view of Theorem 5.1.4 $\zeta_{Q,P}(s)$ extends meromorphically to the complex plane with simple poles at the points $(q+m-k)/p, k=0,1,\ldots$. Furthermore,

$$|\Gamma(s)\zeta_{Q,P}(s)| \le C_{N,a,b}|z|^{-N}, \quad |z|\ge z_0>0, a\le \operatorname{Re} z\le b. \qquad (1.11)$$

Since the $\Gamma$–function decays exponentially on finite vertical strips, (1.11) shows that $\zeta_{Q,P}(s)$ is of subexponential growth on finite vertical strips. If $Q=I$ and the principal symbol of $P$ is scalar then it follows from [DG] that $\zeta_P(s)$ is actually of polynomial growth on finite vertical strips. However, as far as the author knows, this is not clear for general $Q, P$.

We note that (1.11) is true whenever the expansion (1.9) can be differentiated. In particular, this is true for the expansions derived in Section 2.4.

Finally we introduce the $\eta$–function and the $\eta$–invariant:

Abstractly, consider a self–adjoint operator, $P$, with dense domain, $\mathcal{D}(P)$, in some Hilbert space, $H$. If we assume that

$$(P+i)^{-1}\in C_p(H), \quad \text{for some } p>0, \qquad (1.12)$$

(where $C_p$ denotes the VON NEUMANN–SCHATTEN class of order $p$) then the function

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(P;s) &:= \zeta_{P,P^2}(\frac{s+1}{2}) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\int_0^\infty t^{(s-1)/2}\operatorname{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2})dt\\ &= \sum_{\lambda\in\operatorname{spec} P\setminus\{0\}} (\operatorname{sgn}\lambda)|\lambda|^{-s} \qquad (1.13)\end{aligned}$$

is called the $\eta$–function of $P$.

If we have an asymptotic expansion

$$\operatorname{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2}) \sim_{t\searrow 0} \sum_{\substack{\operatorname{Re}\alpha\to\infty\\ 0\le k\le k(\alpha)}} a_{\alpha k}\, t^\alpha \log^k t, \qquad (1.14)$$

then $\eta(P;s)$ extends meromorphically to the complex plane with poles situated at the points $-2\alpha-1$. Moreover, the principal part at $-2\alpha-1$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\sum_{k=0}^{k(\alpha)} a_{\alpha k}\,(-1)^k k! 2^{k+1}(s+2\alpha+1)^{-k-1}. \qquad (1.15)$$

Finally, the $\eta$–invariant of $P$ is defined as

$$\eta(P) := \operatorname{Res}_0 \eta(P;0). \qquad (1.16)$$

## 5.2 $\eta$–Functions of Fuchs Type Differential Operators

For the discussion of the $\eta$–invariant of a symmetric differential operator $P$, we need the asymptotic expansion of $\mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2})$, which is different from the heat asymptotics. First, we briefly present the extension of the considerations of Section 2.2 to this situation. For that purpose let $N$ be a compact manifold, $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ a symmetric elliptic differential operator, and $P$ a scalable self–adjoint extension. We have a pointwise asymptotic expansion

$$\mathrm{tr}((Pe^{-tP^2})(\xi,\xi)) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(\xi, P, P^2)\, t^{\frac{n-m-\mu}{2\mu}} \tag{2.1}$$

and Lemma 2.2.3 immediately yields

$$a_n((x,p), P, P^2) = x^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m-n)-1} a_n((1,p), P, P^2). \tag{2.2}$$

This is the analogue of (2.2.6). We put

$$k(t, P, P^2) := \int_N \mathrm{tr}((Pe^{-tP^2})(1,p,1,p))dp. \tag{2.3}$$

**Lemma 5.2.1** *There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $k(\cdot, P, P^2) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\frac{1}{2}+\delta}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. More precisely,*

$$k(t, P, P^2) = O(t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta}), \quad t \to \infty, \tag{2.4}$$

*and*

$$\begin{aligned} k(t,P,P^2) \quad &\sim_{t\to 0} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_N a_n((1,p), P, P^2)dp \;\; t^{\frac{n-m-\mu}{2\mu}} \\ &=: \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n(P,P^2) \;\; t^{\frac{n-m-\mu}{2\mu}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

**Proof** As in the proof of Lemma 2.2.4 we start from the estimate

$$|(Pe^{-P^2})(x,p,y,q)| \le C(xy)^{\varepsilon-\frac{1}{2}}$$

for $x, y \le x_0, p, q \in N$. In view of the scaling formula (2.2.3), we obtain

$$|(Pe^{-tP^2})(x,p,y,q)| \le C(xy)^{\varepsilon-\frac{1}{2}} t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu}},$$

thus (2.4) is proved. The asymptotics as $t \to 0$ is a consequence of (2.1). □

The analogue of Theorem 2.4.6 is

**Theorem 5.2.2** *Let $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mu,\nu}(N^\wedge, E)$ be a symmetric elliptic operator and $P$ a scalable self–adjoint extension. Then, for $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ with $\varphi \equiv 1$ near $0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(\varphi P e^{-tP^2}) \quad \sim_{t\to 0} \quad & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} {\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-}_{N^\wedge} \varphi(x) a_n((x,p), P, P^2) dp dx\, t^{\frac{n-m-\mu}{2\mu}} \\ & + \frac{1}{2\nu} \mathrm{Res}_0(Mk(\cdot, P, P^2))(-\frac{1}{2})\, t^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2\nu} b_m(P, P^2)\, t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log t. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** Analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.4.6 we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(\varphi P e^{-tP^2}) &= \int_0^\infty \varphi(x)x^{-1-\nu}\int_N \mathrm{tr}((Pe^{-tP^2})(1,p,1,p))dpdx\\ &=: s^{-1-\nu}\int_0^\infty \varphi(x)F(\frac{x}{s})dx\end{aligned}$$

with $s := t^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}$ and

$$F(\xi) = \xi^{-1-\nu}k(\xi^{-2\nu}, P, P^2).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}F(\xi) &= O(\xi^{2\delta\nu-1}),\ \xi \to 0,\\ F(\xi) &\sim_{\xi\to\infty} \sum_{n=0}^\infty b_n(P,P^2)\xi^{\frac{\nu}{\mu}(m-n)-1},\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows completely analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.4.6. □

As an immediate consequence we obtain the following:

**Theorem 5.2.3** *Let $M$ be a compact manifold with conic singularities and let $P_0 \in \mathrm{Diff}^{\mu,\nu}(M,E)$ a symmetric elliptic operator. Assume for $x < \varepsilon$*

$$P_0 = X^{-\nu}\sum_{n=0}^\infty A_k(-X\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k,$$

*i. e. $A_k$ is constant for $x < \varepsilon$. Let $P$ be a scalable self–adjoint extension. Then the function*

$$f(t) = \mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2})$$

*lies in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{as}}(\mathbf{R}_+)$. More precisely, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $t \geq t_0$*

$$|f(t)| = O(e^{-t\varepsilon})$$

*and*

$$\begin{aligned}f(t) \sim_{t\to 0} &\sum_{n=0}^\infty \int\!\!\!\!\!\!-_M a_n(\xi,P,P^2)d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-m-\mu}{2\mu}}\\ &+\frac{1}{2\nu}\mathrm{Res}_0(Mk(\cdot,P,P^2))(-\frac{1}{2})t^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2\nu}b_m(P,P^2)t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\log t.\end{aligned}$$

*Now,*

$$\eta(P,s) := \Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})^{-1}\int\!\!\!\!\!\!-_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\mathrm{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2})dt = \Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})^{-1}(Mf)(\frac{s+1}{2})$$

*is a meromorphic function in $\mathbf{C}$ with simple poles in $\frac{m-n}{\mu}, n \neq m$. A priori, $0$ is a pole of order $2$.*

*We put $\eta(P,0) := \mathrm{Res}_0(\eta(P,\cdot))(0)$.*

Our considerations show that for proving the existence of the $\eta$–function as a meromorphic function in $\mathbf{C}$, we only need the following data:

a Riemannian manifold as in (1.4.1), (2.6)

a symmetric elliptic operator $P_0 : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(E)$ and a self–adjoint extension $P$ that has the property (SE) over $U$, (2.7)

an asymptotic expansion

$$\operatorname{Tr}(Pe^{-tP^2}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{\substack{\operatorname{Re}\,\alpha\to\infty \\ 0\le k\le k(\alpha)}} a_{\alpha k}\, t^\alpha \log^k t. \tag{2.8}$$

We now turn to the operators investigated in Section 4.2.1.

**Lemma 5.2.4** *Let $D := \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + f(x)A)$, $f(x) = 1$ or $f(x) = 1/x$, as in* (4.2.3) *(resp.* (4.2.4)*). Assume that the deficiency indices of $D$ coincide und let $D_\sigma$ be a (scalable) self–adjoint extension as described in Section* 4.2.1*. For $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, we then have*

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\varphi D_\sigma e^{-tD_\sigma^2}) = 0.$$

**Proof** We put

$$\varepsilon : L^2(E|N) \to L^2(E|N)\,, \varepsilon = -1_{(-\infty,0)}(A) \oplus \sigma \oplus 1_{(0,\infty)}(A).$$

$\varepsilon$ also acts on $L^2(E)$ in a natural way. Hence it leaves $\mathcal{D}(D_\sigma)$ invariant and anticommutes with $D_\sigma$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Tr}(\varphi D_\sigma e^{-tD_\sigma^2}) &= \operatorname{Tr}(\varphi\varepsilon^2 D_\sigma e^{-tD_\sigma^2})\\ &= \operatorname{Tr}(\varphi\varepsilon D_\sigma e^{-tD_\sigma^2}\varepsilon)\\ &= \operatorname{Tr}(\varphi\varepsilon D_\sigma \varepsilon e^{-tD_\sigma^2})\\ &= -\operatorname{Tr}(\varphi D_\sigma e^{-tD_\sigma^2}).\end{aligned}$$

□

As a consequence we obtain

**Theorem 5.2.5** *Let $M$ be a compact manifold with conic singularities (resp. with boundary) and $D_0$ a symmetric elliptic differential operator on $M$. Assume that near the cone tip (the boundary) $D$ has the form*

$$D = \Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + f(x)A)$$

*with $f(x) = 1/x$ (resp. $f(x) = 1$), where $\Gamma$ and $A$ are as in Section* 4.2.1*. If $D_\sigma$ is a scalable self–adjoint extension, then $D_\sigma$ has the properties* (2.6)*–*(2.8)*. More precisely,*

$$\operatorname{Tr}(D_\sigma e^{-tD_\sigma^2}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{n=0}^\infty \int_{M_\varepsilon} a_n(\xi, D, D^2) d\xi\, t^{\frac{n-m-1}{2}}.$$

*The $\eta$–function of $D_\sigma$ has a meromorphic extension to $\mathbf{C}$ with the same poles as in the case of a closed compact manifold.*

*If $D$ is a Dirac operator and $m \equiv 1 \bmod 2$, then*

$$a_n(\xi, D, D^2) = 0, \quad n = 0, \cdots, m+1,$$

*i. e. $\eta(D_\sigma, s)$ is holomorphic for* $\operatorname{Re}(s) > -2$.

**Proof** We already know that $D_\sigma$ has the properties (2.6) and (2.7). (2.8) is a consequence of the preceding Lemma and Theorem 1.4.11. The vanishing of the $a_n$ is [BG, Theorem 3.4]. □

**Remark** In the case of Dirac operators on a compact manifold with boundary the preceding theorem is due to [DW].

## 5.3 The Variation Formula for the $\eta$–invariant

In this section we derive the usual variation formula for the $\eta$–invariant of a family of differential operators having the properties (2.6)–(2.8) provided the family is constant outside a compact set. By virtue of the last section, we know that (2.6)–(2.8) is true for differential operators of FUCHS type resp. operators of APS–type. For the rest of this section let $P$ be a self–adjoint differential operator as in the preceding section which satisfies (2.6)–(2.8). Moreover, let $(V_a)_{a\in I}$ be a $C^\infty$–family of symmetric differential operators with $\operatorname{ord} V_a \leq \operatorname{ord} P =: \mu$, $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ an interval, such that

$$\operatorname{supp}\, V_a \subset \overset{\circ}{K}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $K \subset M$ is compact with smooth boundary. We put

$$P_a := P + V_a \tag{3.2}$$

and *assume* that $P_a$ is elliptic for all $a$.

**Lemma 5.3.1** *The operator $P_a$ is self–adjoint on $\mathcal{D}(P)$.*

**Proof** Since $P$ is elliptic we have $\mathcal{D}(P) \subset H^\mu_{\text{loc}}(E)$ and hence in view of (3.1) the operator $V_a$ maps $\mathcal{D}(P)$ continuously into $L^2(E)$.

We choose a cut–off function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ with $\varphi|K \equiv 1$. Then, for any $u \in \mathcal{D}(P)$

$$V_a u = V_a \varphi u = \varphi V_a u.$$

$\varphi u \in \mathcal{D}(V_{a,\min})$ by Lemma 1.1.15 and thus we find for $u, v \in \mathcal{D}(P)$

$$(V_a u|v) = (V_a u|\varphi v) = (u|V_a \varphi v) = (u|V_a v),$$

i.e. $V_a$ is symmetric on $\mathcal{D}(P)$.

To prove the self–adjointness of $P_a$ on $\mathcal{D}(P)$ we put $\widetilde{P}_a := P_a|\mathcal{D}(P)$ and consider $u \in \mathcal{D}(\widetilde{P}_a^*)$. Then we find for arbitrary $v \in \mathcal{D}(P)$, with the $\varphi$ as before,

$$\begin{aligned}(\widetilde{P}_a^* u|v) &= (u|P_a v) = (u|Pv) + (\varphi u|V_a v)\\ &= (u|Pv) + (V_a \varphi u|v)\\ &= (u|Pv) + (V_a u|v).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $u \in \mathcal{D}(P^*) = \mathcal{D}(P)$ and we are done. □

From now on we write again $P_a$ for the operator $\widetilde{P}_a$.

Let $C \subset \mathbf{C}$ be the domain

$$C = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid z = |z| e^{i\varphi}\,,\, 0 < \varepsilon \le |\varphi| \le \pi - \varepsilon\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Furthermore, we put

$$\dot{P}_a := \frac{d}{d_a} V_a. \tag{3.4}$$

**Lemma 5.3.2** *$(P_a - \lambda)^{-k}$ is a trace class operator for $k$ large enough and $\lambda \in C$. Furthermore, for $\lambda_0 > 0$ there exists a $c > 0$ such that*

$$\|(P_a - \lambda)^{-k}\|_{\mathrm{tr}} \le c$$

*for $\lambda \in C$, locally uniform in $a$. Moreover*

$$\frac{d}{da} \mathrm{Tr}((P_a - \lambda)^{-k}) = -k \mathrm{Tr}(\dot{P}_a (P_a - \lambda)^{-k-1}).$$

**Proof** From (2.7) and Proposition 1.4.7 it follows that $(P_a - \lambda)^{-k}$ is trace class for $k$ large enough. Let $a_0 \in I, \lambda_0 > 0$ be given. W. l. o. g. let $\pm\lambda_0 \notin \operatorname{spec} P_{a_0}$. Since $V_a$ is a $C^\infty$–family of differential operators of order $\le \mu$ and $\operatorname{supp} V_a \subset \overset{\circ}{K}$, we find that

$$I \to \mathcal{L}(H^\mu(K, E), L^2(K, E)), \quad a \mapsto V_a$$

is a $C^\infty$–map. We apply Lemma 1.1.17 to conclude that for $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that, for $|a - a_0| < \delta$,

$$\|(V_a - V_{a_0})(P_{a_0} - \lambda_0)^{-1}\| < \varepsilon.$$

Consequently

$$\|(V_a - V_{a_0})(P_{a_0} - \lambda)^{-1}\| < \varepsilon \|(P_{a_0} - \lambda_0)(P_{a_0} - \lambda)^{-1}\|.$$

For a suitable choice of $\varepsilon$ this is always $< \frac{1}{2}$ for $|\lambda| \ge \lambda_0$. We obtain

$$(P_a - \lambda)^{-1} = (P_{a_0} - \lambda)^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n ((V_a - V_{a_0})(P_{a_0} - \lambda)^{-1})^n, \tag{3.5}$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P_a - \lambda)^{-k}\|_{\mathrm{tr}} &= \|(P_a - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{C_k} \\ &\le 2\|(P_{a_0} - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{C_k} \\ &\le 2\|(P_{a_0} - \lambda_0)^{-1}\|_{C_k} \|(P_{a_0} - \lambda_0)(P_{a_0} - \lambda)^{-1}\| \le c. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_k$ denotes the $k^{\mathrm{th}}$ VON NEUMANN–SCHATTEN class. From (3.5) we also infer that the map

$$I \to C_k, \quad a \mapsto (P_a - \lambda)^{-1}$$

is differentiable and

$$\frac{d}{da}(P_a - \lambda)^{-1} = -(P_a - \lambda)\dot{P}_a (P_a - \lambda)^{-1},$$

from which we obtain the assertion. □

We need a simple lemma about the space of trace class operators.

**Lemma 5.3.3** *Let* $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ *be an interval and* $\mathcal{H}$ *a* HILBERT *space. Let* $f, g : I \to C_1(\mathcal{H})$ *be continuous maps into the space of trace class operators. Assume* $f, g$ *to be differentiable with respect to the operator norm in* $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$*. Then,* $fg : I \to C_1(\mathcal{H}), a \mapsto f(a)g(a)$ *is differentiable (with respect to the trace norm) and*

$$(fg)'(a) = f'(a)g(a) + f(a)g'(a).$$

**Proof** Let $a \in I$ and choose $\delta > 0$ such that $[a-\delta, a+\delta] \subset I$. Since $g : I \to C_1(\mathcal{H})$ is continuous, we have

$$c := \sup_{\xi \in [a-\delta, a+\delta]} \|g(\xi)\|_{C_1} < \infty.$$

We find for $|h| < \delta$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\frac{f(a+h)g(a+h) - f(a)g(a)}{h} - f'(a)g(a) - f(a)g'(a)\|_{C_1} \\
\leq\ & \|\left(\frac{f(a+h) - f(a)}{h} - f'(a)\right) g(a+h)\|_{C_1} \\
&+\|f'(a)(g(a+h) - g(a))\|_{C_1} + \|f(a)\left(\frac{g(a+h) - g(a)}{h} - g'(a)\right)\|_{C_1} \\
\leq\ & \|\frac{f(a+h) - f(a)}{h} - f'(a)\|c + \|f'(a)\|\|g(a+h) - g(a)\|_{C_1} \\
&+\|f(a)\|_{C_1}\|\frac{g(a+h) - g(a)}{h} - g'(a)\| \longrightarrow 0, h \to 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we only have used the differentiability of $f, g$ with respect to the operator norm and the continuity of $g$ with respect to the trace norm. □

**Proposition 5.3.4** *Choose* $\mu > 0$ *such that* $\pm\mu \notin \operatorname{spec}(P_a)$ *for* $a$ *in a small interval and put*

$$E_a^\mu := 1_{(-\infty,-\mu)\cup(\mu,\infty)}(P_a).$$

*Then*

$$\frac{d}{da}\operatorname{Tr}(E_a^\mu P_a e^{-tP_a^2}) = \operatorname{Tr}(E_a^\mu(\dot{P}_a e^{-tP_a^2} - 2t\dot{P}_a P_a^2 e^{-tP_a^2})).$$

For the definition of $E_a^\mu$ cf. the remark after (1.4.24).

**Proof** Denote by $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ the curves

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 &= \{z \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, |\operatorname{Im} z| = \operatorname{Re} z - \mu,\ \operatorname{Re} z \geq \mu\} \\
\gamma_2 &= \{z \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, |\operatorname{Im} z| = |\operatorname{Re} z + \mu|,\ \operatorname{Re} z \leq -\mu\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_1$ is traversed downward and $\gamma_2$ is traversed upward. We put $\Gamma := \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$. We use the preceding lemma with

$$\begin{aligned}
f(a) := E_a^\mu P_a e^{-t/2P_a^2} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma \lambda e^{-t/2\lambda^2}(P_a - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda \\
g(a) := E_a^\mu e^{-t/2P_a^2} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma e^{-t/2\lambda^2}(P_a - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.3.2 shows that the prerequisites of the preceding lemma are fulfilled. Integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(f'(a)g(a)) &= \mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu(\dot{P}_a e^{-tP_a^2} - t\dot{P}_a e^{-tP_a^2})) \\ \mathrm{Tr}(f(a)g'(a)) &= \mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu(-t\dot{P}_a e^{-tP_a^2})). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we obtain

**Theorem 5.3.5** *With the notations of the preceding proposition*

$$\eta^\mu(P_a, s) := \Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})^{-1} \fint_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu P_a e^{-tP_a^2}) dt$$

*is differentiable in $a$ and*

$$\frac{d}{da}\eta^\mu(P_a, s) = -s\mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu \dot{P}_a (P_a^2)^{-\frac{s+1}{2}}).$$

*The function*

$$I \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \quad a \mapsto \tilde{\eta}(P_a, 0) = \frac{1}{2}(\eta(P_a, 0) + \dim\ker\, P_a) \bmod \mathbf{Z}$$

*is differentiable and*

$$\frac{d}{da}\tilde{\eta}(P_a, 0) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_K a_m(\xi, \dot{P}_a, P_a^2) d\xi.$$

**Proof** The main work is already done and we can adopt the usual proof for compact manifolds [G, Sec. 1.10]. Since $\mu > 0$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu P_a e^{-tP_a^2})$$

decays exponentially as $t \to \infty$ and we can differentiate under the integral for Re $s$ large enough:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{da}\eta^\mu(P_a, s) &= \Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})^{-1} \Big( \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu \dot{P}_a e^{-tP_a^2}) dt \\ &\quad -2\int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s+1}{2}} \mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu \dot{P}_a P_a^2 e^{-tP_a^2}) dt \Big) \\ &= -s\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})^{-1} \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu \dot{P}_a P_a^2 e^{-tP_a^2}) dt \qquad (3.6) \\ &= -s\mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu \dot{P}_a (P_a^2)^{-\frac{s+1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\dot{P}_a$ has compact support, we have the asymptotic expansion

$$\mathrm{Tr}(E_a^\mu \dot{P}_a e^{-tP_a^2}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{n=0}^\infty \int_K a_n(\xi, \dot{P}_a, P_a^2) d\xi \, t^{\frac{n-m-\mu}{2\mu}}$$

and the assertion follows. □

## 5.4 A glimpse at the gluing formula

In this section we briefly report on recent progress in understanding the gluing formula for the $\eta$–invariant.

First of all, the $\eta$–invariant depends on the choice of the self–adjoint extension. For the operators of Theorem 5.2.5 we have

**Theorem 5.4.1** *Under the assumptions of Theorem* 5.2.5 *let* $D_{\sigma_1}, D_{\sigma_2}$ *be two scalable self–adjoint extensions of* $D$. *Then*

$$\widetilde{\eta}(D_{\sigma_1},0)-\widetilde{\eta}(D_{\sigma_2},0)\equiv\frac{1}{2\pi i}\log\det(\sigma_1\sigma_2|\ker(\Gamma-i))\bmod\mathbf{Z}.$$

For Dirac operators with APS boundary conditions this is [LW, Theorem 3.1]. Their proof can essentially be adopted.

Next, let $M$ be a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $m$ and let

$$D_0 : C_0^\infty(S)\longrightarrow C_0^\infty(S)$$

be a first order symmetric elliptic differential operator on the hermitian vector bundle $S\to M$.

Let $N\subset M$ be a compact hypersurface. We assume that $N$ has a tubular neighborhood $U$ isometric to $(-1,1)\times N$ and that the hermitian structure of $S$ is a product, too. Moreover, we assume that on $U$ the operator $D_0$ has the form

$$D_0=\Gamma(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+A), \tag{4.1}$$

as in (4.2.1)–(4.2.3).

Let $D$ be the restriction of $D_0$ to $C_0^\infty(S|M\setminus N)$. This operator is no longer essentially self–adjoint; in order to obtain self–adjoint extensions one has to impose boundary conditions. The natural boundary condition inherited from $M$ is the *continuous transmission* boundary condition. Interpreting sections of $S$ with support in $U$ as functions $[-1,1]\to L^2(N,S)$ in the obvious way, this boundary condition reads

$$f(0-)=f(0+). \tag{4.2}$$

It is fairly clear that the resulting self–adjoint operator is unitarily equivalent to the closure of $D_0$ in $L^2(M,S)$. On the other hand, $D$ lives naturally on

$$M^{\mathrm{cut}}:=(M\setminus U)\cup_{\partial(M\setminus U)}((-1,0]\times N\cup[0,1)\times N) \tag{4.3}$$

obtained by cutting $M$ along $N$ (we adopt here the notation from [DF, p. 5164 and Sec. 4]). Thus, $M^{\mathrm{cut}}$ is obtained from $M$ by artificially introducing two copies of $N$ as boundary.

We introduce the projections

$$P_+:=1_{(0,\infty)}(A),\quad P_-:=1_{(-\infty,0)}(A),\quad P_0:=I-P_+-P_-. \tag{4.4}$$

Then a natural interpolation between the continuous transmission and the ATIYAH–PATODI–SINGER boundary condition is given by the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \cos\theta\, P_+(A)f(0+) &= \sin\theta\, P_+(A)f(0-), \\ \sin\theta\, P_-(A)f(0+) &= \cos\theta\, P_-(A)f(0-), \end{aligned} \tag{4.5a}$$

$$P_0(A)f(0+) = P_0(A)f(0-), \tag{4.5b}$$

where $|\theta| < \pi/2$. Furthermore, we introduce

$$\mathcal{D}_\theta := \{u \in C^\infty(M^{\mathrm{cut}}, S) \mid u|U \text{ satisfies } (4.5\mathrm{a,b})\} \tag{4.6a}$$

and

$$D_\theta := D_0|\mathcal{D}_\theta. \tag{4.6b}$$

With these preparations we can state the following result:

**Theorem 5.4.2** *Let* $|\theta| < \pi/2$.

1. $D_\theta$ *is essentially self–adjoint. We denote the closure again by* $D_\theta$.
2. $\eta(D_\theta; s)$ *has a meromorphic continuation to the whole complex plane with simple poles at* $m - k, k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. 0 *is a regular point.*
3. *The reduced* $\eta$*–invariant*

$$\widetilde{\eta}(D_\theta) = \frac{1}{2}(\eta(D_\theta) + \dim\ker\, D_\theta) \bmod \mathbf{Z}$$

*is independent of* $\theta$.

This immediately implies the gluing formula in the version of Dai and Freed [DF, Sec. IV].

For a proof of Theorem 5.4.2 and generalizations we refer to [BL5].

# Bibliographic Notes

The $\eta$–invariant was introduced by ATIYAH, PATODI and SINGER in their seminal papers [APS].

$\eta$–functions of FUCHS type differential operators of order 1 were considered first by CHEEGER [C4] who investigated the signature operator on a manifold with conic singularities.

The $\eta$–function of an operator of APS type was introduced by DOUGLAS and WOJCIECHOWSKI [DW]. They assumed the additional hypothesis

$$\ker\, A = 0.$$

Lateron, MÜLLER [Mu] gave a thorough analysis without this assumption.

Theorem 5.4.1 was proved in [LW] and also independently in [Mu].

The gluing formula was first proved by BUNKE [Bu3]. Another proof is due to WOJCIECHOWSKI [W1, W2]. DAI and FREED [DF] simplified the proof of the gluing formula considerably. Moreover, they interpreted the reduced $\eta$–invariant as a section of a certain determinant line bundle. They calculated the covariant derivative of this section for families of operators over a compact Riemannian manifold.

Theorem 5.4.2 is due to the author and BRÜNING [BL5].

# Bibliography

[A1] N. Anghel: *An abstract index theorem on non-compact Riemannian manifolds.* Houston J. Math. **19** (1993), 223–237

[A2] N. Anghel: *On the index of Callias-type operators.* Geom. Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), 431–438

[APS] M. F. Atiyah, V. K. Patodi and I. M. Singer: *Spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry I,II,III.* Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., I: **77** (1975), 43–69; II: **78** (1975), 405–432; III: **79** (1976), 71–99

[ABS] M. F. Atiyah, R. Bott and A. Shapiro: *Clifford modules.* Topology **3** (1964), 3–38

[BGV] N. Berline, E. Getzler and M. Vergne: *Heat kernels and Dirac operators.* Grundlehren No. 298, Springer–Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1992

[BG] T. Branson and P. Gilkey: *Residues of the eta–function for an operator of Dirac type.* J. Funct. Anal. **108** (1992), 47–87

[BD] Th. Bröcker and T. tom Dieck: *Representations of compact Lie groups.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1985

[B1] J. Brüning: *Heat Equation Asymptotics for Singular Sturm–Liouville Operators.* Math. Ann. **268** (1984), 173–196

[B2] J. Brüning: *Heat kernel asymptotics for operator valued Sturm–Liouville equations.* Analysis **8** (1988), 73–93

[B3] J. Brüning: *$L^2$–index theorems for certain complete manifolds.* J. Diff. Geom. **32** (1990), 491–532

[B4] J. Brüning: *On $L^2$–index theorems for complete manifolds of rank–one type.* Duke Math. J. **66** (1992), 257–309

[BL1] J. Brüning and M. Lesch: *Hilbert complexes.* J. Funct. Anal. **108** (1992), 88–132

[BL2] J. Brüning and M. Lesch: *Kähler–Hodge theory for conformal complex cones.* Geom. Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), 439–473

[BL3] J. Brüning and M. Lesch: *The spectral rigidity of curve singularities.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **319** (1994), 181–185

[BL4] J. BRÜNING and M. LESCH: *On the spectral geometry of algebraic curves.* J. Reine Angew. Math. **474** (1996), 25–66

[BL5] J. BRÜNING and M. LESCH: *On the eta–invariant of certain nonlocal boundary value problems.* Preprint, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, 1996

[BM] J. BRÜNING and H. MOSCOVICI: *$L^2$–index for certain Dirac–Schrödinger operators.* Duke Math. J. **66** (1992), 311–336

[BPS] J. BRÜNING, N. PEYERIMHOFF and H. SCHRÖDER: *The $\bar{\partial}$–operator on algebraic curves.* Commun. Math. Phys. **129** (1990), 525–534

[BS1] J. BRÜNING and R. SEELEY: *Regular Singular Asymptotics.* Adv. Math. **58** (1985), 133–148

[BS2] J. BRÜNING and R. SEELEY: *The resolvent expansion for second order regular singular operators.* J. Funct. Anal. **73** (1987), 369–429

[BS3] J. BRÜNING and R. SEELEY: *An index theorem for first order regular singular operators.* Amer. J. Math. **110** (1988), 659–714

[BS4] J. BRÜNING and R. SEELEY: *The expansion of the resolvent near a singular stratum of conical type.* J. Funct. Anal. **95** (1991), 255–290

[Bu1] U. BUNKE: *Relative index theory.* J. Funct. Anal. **105** (1992), 63–76

[Bu2] U. BUNKE: *A K–theoretic relative index theorem and Callias–type Dirac operators.* Math. Ann. **303** (1995), 241–279

[Bu3] U. BUNKE: *On the gluing problem for the $\eta$–invariant.* J. Diff. Geom. **41** (1995), 397–448

[Ca1] C. CALLIAS: *Axial anomalies and index theorems on open spaces.* Commun. Math. Phys. **62** (1978), 213–234

[Ca2] C. CALLIAS: *The heat equation with singular coefficients I.* Commun. Math. Phys. **88** (1983), 357–385

[CU] C. CALLIAS and G. UHLMANN: *Asymptotics of the scattering amplitude for singular potentials.* Preprint

[C1] J. CHEEGER: *On the spectral geometry of spaces with cone–like singularities.* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **76** (1979), 2103–2106

[C2] J. CHEEGER: *On the Hodge theory of Riemannian pseudomanifolds.* In: Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **36** (1980), 91–146

[C3] J. CHEEGER: *Spectral geometry of singular Riemannian spaces.* J. Diff. Geom. **18** (1983), 575–657

[C4] J. CHEEGER: *$\eta$–invariants, the adiabatic approximation and conical singularities.* J. Diff. Geom. **26** (1987), 175–221

[CGT] J. CHEEGER, M. GROMOV and M. E. TAYLOR: *Finite propagation speed, kernel estimates for functions of the Laplace operator, and the geometry of complete Riemannian manifolds.* J. Diff. Geom. **17** (1982), 15–53

[Ch] P. R. CHERNOFF: *Essential self–adjointness of powers of generators of hyperbolic equations.* J. Funct. Anal. **12** (1973), 401–414

[Chou] A. W. CHOU: *The Dirac operator on spaces with conical singularities and positive scalar curvature.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **289** (1985), 1–40

[Co] S. COLOMBO: *Les transformations de Mellin et de Hankel.* Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1959

[DF] X. DAI and D. S. FREED: *$\eta$–invariants and determinant lines.* J. Math. Phys. **35** (1994), 5155–5194

[D1] H. DONNELLY: *Essential spectrum and heat kernel.* J. Funct. Anal. **75** (1987), 362–381

[D2] H. DONNELLY: *Eta invariants for G–spaces.* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **27** (1978), 889–918

[DW] R. G. DOUGLAS and K. P. WOJCIECHOWSKI: *Adiabatic limits of the $\eta$-invariants: the odd–dimensional Atiyah–Patodi–Singer problem.* Commun. Math. Phys. **142** (1991), 139–168

[DS] N. DUNFORD and J. T. SCHWARZ: *Linear Operators.* Interscience Pub., 1963, reprinted Wiley Classics Library, 1988

[DG] J. J. DUISTERMAAT and V. W. GUILLEMIN: *The spectrum of positive elliptic operators and periodic bicharacteristics.* Invent. Math. **29** (1975), 39–79

[G] P. GILKEY: *Invariance theory, the heat equation, and the Atiyah–Singer index theorem.* Publish or Perish, Wilmington, DE, 1984

[Gr] P. GREINER: *An asymptotic expansion for the heat equation.* Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **41** (1971), 163–218

[GL] M. GROMOV and H. B. LAWSON: *Positive scalar curvature and the Dirac operator on complete Riemannian manifolds.* IHES Publ. Math. **58** (1983), 83–196

[GrSe] G. GRUBB and R. SEELEY: *Weakly parametric pseudodifferential operators and Atiyah–Patodi–Singer boundary problems.* Invent. Math. **121** (1995), 481–529

[H] N. HIGSON: *A note on the cobordism invariance of the index.* Topology **30** (1991), 439–443

[K] V. A. KONDRAT'EV: *Boundary value problems for elliptic equations in domains with conical points.* Trudy Mosk. Mat. Obšč **16** (1967), 209–292 (Transactions Moscow Math. Soc. (1967), 227–313)

[LM] H. B. LAWSON and M. L. MICHELSOHN: *Spin geometry.* Princeton University Press, Princeton N. J., 1989

[L1] M. LESCH: *Deficiency indices for symmetric Dirac operators on manifolds with conical singularities.* Topology **32** (1993), 611–623

[L2] M. LESCH: *Deficiency indices, cobordism invariance of the Clifford index and positive scalar curvature.* Report No. 262, Augsburg, 1992

[L3] M. LESCH: *A singular elliptic estimate and applications.* In: Pseudo–Differential Calculus and Mathematical Physics (M. Demuth, E. Schrohe and B.W. Schulze eds.), Advances in Partial Differential Equations, Akademie Verlag, 1994, 259–276

[LW] M. LESCH and K. P. WOJCIECHOWSKI: *On the $\eta$–invariant of generalized Atiyah–Patodi–Singer boundary value problems.* To appear in Illinois Math. J.

[M] R. B. MELROSE: *The Atiyah–Patodi–Singer index theorem.* A K Peters, Wellesley, Ma, 1993

[Mu] W. MÜLLER: *Eta invariants and manifolds with boundary.* J. Diff. Geom. **40** (1994), 311–377

[P] R. S. PALAIS: *Seminar on the Atiyah–Singer index theorem.* Ann. Math. Studies, 1965

[Ra] J. RÅDE: *Callias' index theorem, elliptic boundary conditions, and cutting and gluing.* Commun. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), 51–61

[R] E. D. RAINVILLE: *Special Functions.* Chelsea Publishing, Bronx, New York, 1960

[RS] S. REMPEL and B. W. SCHULZE: *Asymptotics for elliptic mixed boundary problems.* Akademie–Verlag, Berlin, 1989

[R1] J. ROE: *Partitioning non–compact manifolds and the dual Toeplitz problem.* In: Operator algebras and applications (D. Evans and M. Takesaki eds.), Cambridge University Press, 1989, 187–228

[R2] J. ROE: *Elliptic operators, topology and asymptotic methods.* Pitman Research Notes No. 179, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1988

[Sch1] B. W. SCHULZE: *Pseudo–differential operators on manifolds with singularities.* North–Holland, Amsterdam, 1991

[Sch2] B. W. SCHULZE: *Pseudo-differential boundary value problems, conical singularities, and asymptotics.* Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1994

[Sh] M. A. SHUBIN: *Pseudodifferential operators and spectral theory.* Springer, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1980

[T] M. E. TAYLOR: *Pseudodifferential Operators.* Princeton University Press, Princeton New Jersey, 1981

[Wa] G. N. WATSON: *A treatise on the theory of Bessel functions.* Cambridge University Press, Reprinted, 1980

[We] J. WEIDMANN: *Linear operators in Hilbert spaces.* Springer–Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1980

[W1] K. P. WOJCIECHOWSKI: *The additivity of the $\eta$–invariant. The case of an invertible tangential operator.* Houston J. Math. **20** (1994), 603–621

[W2] K. P. WOJCIECHOWSKI: *The additivity of the $\eta$–invariant. The case of a singular tangential operator.* Commun. Math. Phys. **109** (1995), 315–327

[Wo] J. WOLF: *Essential self–adjointness for the Dirac operator and its square.* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **22** (1973), 611–640

[Yo] K. YOSHIKAWA: *On the spectrum of the Laplace operator on singular algebraic curves* Preprint 1993

[Y] K. YOSIDA: *Functional analysis.* Grundlehren No. 123, Springer–Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1968

# Index

algebraic curve, 11, 72
Anghel, N., 104, 131
APS, 44–45
Atiyah, M.F., 10, 75, 105, 113, 146

Bessel function, 61
    modified, 64
Borel functional calculus, 44
Bott, R., 105, 113
Brüning, J., 4, 5, 46, 47, 55, 56, 79, 146
Bunke, U., 5, 104, 131, 134, 146

Callias, C., 6, 78, 106
Carleman operator, 94
change of variables, *see* regularized integral
character ring, 110
characteristic function, 44
Cheeger, J., 1, 4, 7, 78, 104, 146
Chernoff, P.R., 5, 82, 103, 104
Chernoff operator, 88–103, 121, 123–131
    Fredholm criteria, 91
    definition, 88
Chou, A.W., 78
Clifford algebra, 111
Clifford module, 113
$Cl_k$–Cobordism Theorem, 123
$Cl_k$–Deficiency Index Theorem, 123
$Cl_k$–Fredholm index, 114
$Cl_k$–module, 113
Cobordism Theorem
    $Cl_k$, 123
    $G$–equivariant, 121
conormal symbol, 13

Dai, X., 146
deficiency index, 107–116
    $Cl_k$, 113
    G–equivariant, 110
    localization, 116
Deficiency Index Theorem, 121
    $Cl_k$, 123
Dirac–Schrödinger operator, 106, 124–131
domain, *see* operator
Donnelly, H., 5, 82, 104
Douglas, R.G., 146
Duhamel's principle, 41, 97

elliptic, 13
    parameter dependent, 13, 14
elliptic estimate, 20
    singular, 37, 44–45, 99
embedding theorem, 25
entry–time, 85, 93
$\eta$–invariant, 70, 75, 137, 139
    for operators of order 1, 140

Fredholm criteria
    for Fuchs type operators, 35
    for Chernoff operators, 91, 92
    in general, 90
    via singular elliptic estimate, 40
Freed, D.S., 146
Functional calculus
    Borel, 44

Gårding inequality, 34, 36
Gilkey, P.B., 2
graph scalar product, 107
Gromov, M., 5, 104, 131
Grothendieck group, 113

Hankel transform, 61
heat kernel, 20, 43
Hilbert–Schmidt operator, 39, 99
hypergeometric function, 65

index theorem
    Deficiency Index Theorem, 121
        $Cl_k$, 123
    for Fuchs type operators, 74

    for DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operators, 130
  of BRÜNING–SEELEY, 75
  relative, 102–103
    for CHERNOFF operators, 102
    for DIRAC–SCHRÖDINGER operators, 128
Interpolation, complex, 22

LAWSON, H.B., 5, 104, 131
LEGENDRE's duplication formula, 65
LICHNEROWICZ formula, 124
limit
  regularized, 52

manifold
  conformally conic, 10
  singular, 37, 88
  with conic singularities, 12
MCKEAN–SINGER formula, 74
  relative, 101
MELLIN
  boundary symbol, 13
  derivative, 17
  transform, 18, 49, 134
MELROSE, R.B., 1, 2
model cone, 119
model operator, 43
MÜLLER, W., 146
multiplicity, 11, 16

NEUMANN, J. VON, 105
VON NEUMANN–SCHATTEN class, 137, 142

operator
  $Cl_k$–(anti)linear, 111–116, 121–124
  CARLEMAN, 94
  domain, 18
  G–equivariant, 110–111
  HILBERT–SCHMIDT, 39, 99
  pairs of operators, 42, 95
  trace class, 39, 100
  unbounded, 18
    graph scalar product, 107

PATODI, V.K., 10, 75, 146
principal symbol, 13, 83
propagation speed, 81, 83
  bounded, 87
pseudodifferential operator, 20
  parameter dependent, 26

regularized integral, 48
  change of variables, 50, 52, 64
  definition, 49
regularized limit, 52
relative index, 102
RELLICH property, 37
residue, 50
RIEMANN surface, 14

SAL, 55, 71–73
scalable, 58, 120, 138, 139
scalar curvature, 124
scaling formula, 58
SCHULZE, B.–W., 1, 2, 13, 26
SCHWARTZ space, 53
SEELEY, R.T., 4, 5, 46, 47, 55, 56, 79
SHAPIRO, A., 105, 113
SHUBIN, M.A., 2
SINGER, I.M., 10, 75, 146
super bundle, 95
supersymmetric, 95
supertrace, 100

TAYLOR, M.E., 104
trace class operator, 39, 100, 143
trace theorem, 24

$U$–compact, 37, 91

vector bundle, 12

wave equation, 83
WOJCIECHOWSKI, K., 146
WOLF, J., 104

$\zeta$–function
  equivariant, 67

# List of Symbols

Except a few standard notations, all symbols are explained at their first occurence. The standard notations are

| | |
|---|---|
| $\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{C}$ | natural, integer, real and complex numbers |
| $\mathbf{R}_+ = (0, \infty)$ | positive real numbers |
| $C(X), C^\infty(X)$ | continuous functions on $X$ resp. smooth functions on the manifold $X$ |
| $C(X,E), C^\infty(X,E)$ | continuous resp. smooth sections in the vector bundle $E$ over $X$ |
| $\mathcal{L}(X)$ | algebra of bounded operators on the BANACH space $X$ |
| $G\mathcal{L}(X)$ | invertible operators in $\mathcal{L}(X)$ |
| $\mathcal{UL}(\mathcal{H})$ | unitary operators on the HILBERT space $\mathcal{H}$ |
| $\mathcal{L}^p$ | $p$–summable functions w. r. t. a measure |
| $L^2(X,E)$ | square summable sections in the hermitian vector bundle $E$ |
| $\operatorname{spec}(T)$ | spectrum of the linear operator $T$ |
| $\operatorname{supp}(f)$ | support of the function $f$ |

The other symbols are listed below in the order of their first occurrence.

dummy, dummy